13-1573-cv(L)

13-1677-cv(con), 13-1798-cv(con), 13-1830-cv(con), 13-1853-cv(con)

IN THE

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT



IN RE BANK OF AMERICA CORP. SECURITIES, DERIVATIVE, AND EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT (ERISA) LITIGATION

AMP CAPITAL INVESTORS LIMITED, COLONIAL FIRST STATE INVESTMENTS LTD, H.E.S.T. AUSTRALIA LTD, MICHAEL WASHENIK, ORLOFF FAMILY TRUST DTD 10/3/91, ORLOFF FAMILY TRUST DTD 12/31/01, St. Stephen, Inc., Leonard Masiowski, Maryann Masiowski, Michael J. Rinis, Babette Rinis, Michael J. Rinis, IRA,

Objectors-Appellants,

and

CHARLES N. DORNFEST,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

(Additional Caption on the Reverse and Following Page(s))

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (New York City)

BRIEF AND SPECIAL APPENDIX FOR PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT CHARLES N. DORNFEST

Judith L. Spanier ABBEY SPANIER, LLP 212 East 39th Street New York, New York 10016 212-889-3700 Jeffrey H. Squire Raymond A. Bragar Lawrence P. Eagel BRAGAR EAGEL & SQUIRE, P.C. 885 Third Avenue, Suite 3040 New York, New York 10022 212-308-5858

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellant Charles N. Dornfest

 ν .

PUBLIC PENSION FUNDS, THE PUBLIC PENSION FUND GROUP, STEVEN J. SKLAR, AS (IRA ACCOUNT BENEFICIARY), ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED, RHONDA WILSON, ALMA ALVAREZ, MICHAEL R. BAHNMAIER, MARK ADAMS, ELIZABETH EAGEN, VERNON C. DAILEY, RICHARD ADAME, ARLENE KAHN, PETRA CHATMAN, STICHTING PENSIOENFONDS ABP, GRANT MITCHELL, NEW YORK STATE TEACHERS' RETIREMENT SYSTEM, PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ASSOCIATION OF COLORADO, STEVE R. GRABER, INDIVIDUALLY, AS ASSIGNEE OF CLAIMS OF THE SRG 2008 TRUST, SCHWAB SP500 INDEX FUND, SCHWAB 1000 INDEX FUND, SCHWAB INSTITUTIONAL SELECT SP500 FUND, SCHWAB DIVIDEND EQUITY FUND, SCHWAB CORE EQUITY FUND, SCHWAB PREMIER EQUITY FUND, SCHWAB FUNDAMENTAL US LARGE COMPANY INDEX FUND, SCHWAB TOTAL STOCK MARKET INDEX FUND, SCHWAB SP500 INDEX PORTFOLIO, SCHWAB MARKETTRACK GROWTH PORTFOLIO, SCHWAB MARKETTRACK BALANCED PORTFOLIO, SCHWAB INVESTMENTS, SCHWAB CAPITAL TRUST, DR. SALOMON MELGEN, FLOR MELGEN, SFM HOLDINGS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, INTERNATIONAL FUND MANAGEMENT S.A., DEKA INTERNATIONAL S.A. LUXEMBURG, DEKA INVESTMENT GMBH, DI, AARON KATZ, JOEL KATZ, SYLVIA WEISSMANN, PARKER FAMILY INVESTMENTS L.L.C., JEFFREY R. PARKER, THE 1997 JEFFREY R. PARKER FAMILY TRUST, DREW E. PARKER, THE 1994 DREW E. PARKER FAMILY TRUST, KEITH D. PARKER, JULIE M. SORIN, THE 1991 JEFFREY R. PARKER FAMILY TRUST, THE 1994 JULIE P. MANTELL FAMILY TRUST, MICHAEL A. PARKER, MARK D. WENDER, ELLIOT WENDER, PENINA WENDER, STANLEY L. WENDER, RAZELLE M. WENDER, JILL W. GOLDSTEIN, JERRY E. FINGER, AMBASSADOR LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, SELECT INVESTORS EXCHANGE FUND, L.P., RICHARD FINGER, JEF FAMILY TRUST, 1976 REAL ESTATE TRUST, WALTER FINGER, THE JERRY E. FINGER FAMILY TRUST D/T/D 12/28/1989, THE JERRY E. FINGER FAMILY TRUST, LEO R. JALENAK, PEGGY E. JALENAK, KERS & CO., ROBERT GEGNAS, 198 LOCHA DRIVE, JUPITER, FL 334587752, STEVEN L. SHAPIRO, HARVEY M. MITNICK, NATHAN A. FRIEDMAN, BONNIE FRIEDMAN, KENNETH A. CIULLO, JOANNA CIULLO, THOMAS P. DINAPOLI, COMPTROLLER OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, AS ADMINISTRATIVE HEAD OF THE NEW YORK STATE AND LOCAL RETIREMENT SYSTEMS AND AS SOLE TRUSTEE OF THE NEW YORK STATE COMMON RETIREMENT FUND, SCHWAB FINANCIAL SERVICES FUND, O. TEMPLE SLOAN, JR.,

Plaintiffs-Appellees,

v.

BANK OF AMERICA CORP., GARY A. CARLIN, NELSON CHAI, KENNETH D. LEWIS, JOHN A. THAIN, FRANK P. BRAMBLE, SR., WILLIAM BARNET, III, JOHN T. COLLINS,

GARY L. COUNTRYMAN, TOMMY R. FRANKS, CHARLES K. GIFFORD, MONICA C. LOZANO, WALTER E. MASSEY, THOMAS J. MAY, PATRICIA E. MITCHELL, THOMAS M. RYAN, MEREDITH R. SPANGLER, ROBERT L. TILLMAN, JACKIE M. WARD, NEIL A. COTTY, JOE L. PRICE, BANC OF AMERICA SECURITIES L.L.C., MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH INCORPORATED, BANK OF AMERICA, J. STEELE ALPHIN, AMY WOODS BRINKLEY, BARBARA J. DESOER, LIAM E. McGEE, TIMOTHY J. MAYOPOULOS, BRIAN T. MOYNIHAN, BRUCE L. HAMMONDS, RICHARD K. STRUTHERS, BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION CORPORATE BENEFITS COMMITTEE DEFENDANTS, BANK OF AMERICA COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS COMMITTEE DEFENDANTS, KEITH T. BANKS, TERESA BRENNER, CAROL T. CHRIST, ARMANDO M. CODINA, VIRGIS W. COLBERT, GREGORY CURL, JOHN D. FINNEGAN, GREGORY FLEMING, FOX-PITT KELTON COCHRAN CARONIA WALLER (USA) L.L.C., J.C. Flowers & Co., L.L.C., Judith Mayhew Jonas, Aulana L. Peters, Joseph W. PRUEHER, ANN N. REESE, MICHAEL ROSS, CHARLES O. ROSSOTTI, PETER STINGI, THOMAS K. MONTAG, KENNETH D. DAVIS, MARTIN I. FINEBERG, KENNETH A. LEWIS, MERRILL LYNCH & CO., INC., 4 WORLD FINANCIAL CNETER, NEW YORK, NY 10080, BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION, 100 N. TRYON STREET, CHARLOTTE, NC 28255, JOSEPH L. PRICE, JEREMY FINEBERG,

Defendants-Appellees,

and

PETER KRAUS,

Defendant.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION	1
STATEMENT OF ISSUES	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
STATEMENT OF FACTS	12
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	13
STANDARD OF REVIEW	15
ARGUMENT	15
AFTER HOLDING LEAD PLAINTIFFS LACKED STANDING TO REPRESENT THE BOA OPTIONS CLASS, THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED BY PRECLUDING DORNFEST FROM MOVING TO CERTIFY THAT CLASS	15
A. The District Court Erred in Holding That Lead Plaintiffs' Lack of Standing was "Not Meaningful"	15
B. Nothing in the PSLRA Cures Lead Plaintiffs' Lack of Standing	17
CONCLUSION	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Abrahamson v. Bd. of Education, 374 F.3d 66 (2d Cir. 2004)	15
California Public Employees Retirement System v. The Chubb Corp., Civ. No. 00-4285 (GEB), 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27189 (D.N.J. 2002)	21
Cheney v. United States District Court, 542 U.S. 367 (2004)	24
Chill v. Green Tree Financial Corp., 181 F.R.D. 398 (D.Minn. 1998)22	2, 23
City of Pontiac Gen. Employees' Ret. Sys. v. MBIA, Inc., 637 F.3d 169 (2d Cir. 2011)	15
Hevesi v. Citigroup, 366 F.3d 70 (2d Cir. 2004)	1, 22
Hollingsworth v. Perry,U.S, 133 S. Ct. 2652, 186 L.Ed. 2d 768 (June 26, 2013) 1	6, 18
Horizon Asset Mgt. Inc. v. H & R Block, 580 F.3d 755 (8th Cir. 2009)	17
In re Citigroup Inc. Sec. Litig., No. 07-Civ-09901 (SHS) (S.D.N.Y.)	22
In re Lehman Bros. Sec. and ERISA Litig., No. 08 Civ. 6762 (LAK), 2011 WL 1453790 (April 13, 2011 S.D.N.Y.)	0, 21
In re Merrill Lynch & Co. Inc. Sec., Derivative and ERISA Litig., 07-Civ-09633 (JSR) (S.D.N.Y.)	22

No. 09-Civ-00300 (DAB) (S.D.N.Y.)	22
IndyMac Mortgage-Backed Sec. Litig. No. 9 Civ. 4583 (LAK), 2011 WL 2508254 (June 21, 2011 S.D.N.Y.)	20
Italian Colors Rest. v. Am. Express Travel Related Servs. Co., 667 F.3d 204 (2d Cir. 2012) rev'd on other grounds Am. Express Co., v. Italian Colors Rest., 133 S.Ct. 2304 (20	
Miller v. Wachovia, No. 09-Civ-06351 (RJS) (S.D.N.Y.)	22
National Super Spuds, Inc. v. New York Mercantile Exchange, 660 F.2d 9 (2d Cir. 1981)	
Raines v. Byrd, 521 U.S. 811 (1997)	18
Richard Greenshields Securities, Inc. v. Lau, 825 F.2d 647 (2d Cir. 1987)	24
Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., 396 F.3d 96 (2d Cir. 2005)	15
Statutes	
15 U.S.C. § 78aa	1
15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)	1
15 U.S.C. § 78t(a)	1
15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B)	passim
28 U.S.C. § 1291	2
28 U.S.C. § 1292(b)	2. 10. 11

Case 13-1677, Document 82, 08/02/2013, 1007048, Page7 of 112

28 U.S.C. § 1331	
Rules	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(f)	
SEC Rule 10b-5, 17 C.F.R. §240.10b-5	

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The district court had jurisdiction pursuant to Section 27 of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. § 78aa, and 28 U.S.C. § 1331, because this is a civil action arising under the laws of the United States. Specifically, plaintiff-appellant Charles N. Dornfest ("Dornfest") asserted claims under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 78j(b) and 78t(a), and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder, including SEC Rule 10b-5, 17 C.F.R. §240.10b-5 ("Rule 10b-5").

On July 29, 2011, the district court issued a Memorandum and Order (Joint Appendix For Plaintiff-Appellant at A1202-A1226, cited hereafter as "A___") dismissing all of lead plaintiffs' ("Lead Plaintiffs") option claims save one (a two year "leap" option (the "January 2011 Leap Option")) (A1225), and holding that Lead Plaintiffs lacked standing to assert claims for a "BOA Options Class" (i.e., persons who invested in Bank of America ("BOA") options during the Class Period – September 18, 2008 through January 21, 2009, inclusive – and were damaged thereby).

On September 29, 2011, the district court issued a Memorandum and Order (A1488-A1492) holding that Dornfest, an investor in 17 different BOA options, was precluded from making a motion to certify a BOA Options Class. (A1492)

On March 21, 2012, this Court issued a Mandate (A1571-A1572) (i) dismissing, without prejudice to Dornfest's right to seek certification of an interlocutory appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), Dornfest's petition for leave to appeal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(f) from the district court's September 29, 2011 order precluding Dornfest from making a motion to certify the BOA Options Class; and, (ii) denying Dornfest's petition for a writ of mandamus.

On April 16, 2012, the district court issued a Memorandum and Order (A1614-A1617) denying Dornfest's motion for certification of an interlocutory appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) from the district court's September 29, 2011 Order that precluded Dornfest from making a motion to certify the BOA Options Class.

On April 9, 2013, the district court entered a final Judgment (A2009-A2022) that, in relevant part, dismissed Dornfest's complaint.

Plaintiff timely filed his Notice of Appeal (A2079-A2080) on April 25, 2013.

This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

(1) Whether, after first holding that the Lead Plaintiffs lacked standing to represent a class of persons who had invested in the many BOA

options in which Dornfest had invested, did the district court err by then precluding Dornfest from moving to certify a class of such option investors?

(2) Whether the district court erred when it held that the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B) (the "PSLRA"), empowered lead plaintiffs to prevent an investor from moving to certify a class of persons the lead plaintiffs had been held not to represent?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On or about January 21, 2009, the first of a number of class action complaints¹ (A980) was filed against various defendants alleging that during the period from about September 18, 2008, through January 21, 2009 (the "Class Period"), BOA and various defendants made, with scienter, untrue statements of material fact and/or omitted material statements of fact regarding \$5.8 billion in bonuses paid to employees of Merrill Lynch, ("Merrill") and failed to disclose, although required to do so, Merrill's \$21 billion fourth quarter 2008 losses. Those misrepresentations/omissions inflated the price of BOA securities and, when the truth was disclosed in January 2009, the price of those securities plummeted. (A475-476)

Certain of these complaints alleged a class of all persons who, during the class period described therein, purchased BOA securities. For example, a complaint filed by one of Lead Plaintiffs' eventual counsel alleged a class claim on behalf of "all persons who purchased or otherwise acquired the securities of Bank of America in the period from January 2, 2009 through January 20, 2009." (A401)

Various plaintiffs filed notices and motions to be appointed (a) lead plaintiffs for a class of stock purchasers; (b) lead plaintiffs for derivative claimants; and (c) lead plaintiffs for a class of ERISA plaintiffs. (A422-424) Certain of those PSLRA notices, including at least one filed by counsel for a party eventually appointed lead plaintiff, purported to be issued for a class of purchasers of all BOA securities. (A860-A861) The district court (Chin, J.) ordered (A422-A446) the appointment of Lead Plaintiffs and their counsel in the BOA securities action (the "Securities Action") and also coordinated all filed cases. (A446)

On about September 25, 2009, Lead Plaintiffs filed a Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint and alleged class claims on behalf of purchasers of BOA common stock, but did not allege any claims for BOA option investors. (A465-A600)

Since Lead Plaintiffs at that point had not sought to represent a BOA Options Class, on January 13, 2010, Dornfest filed a complaint (A618-A726) alleging claims for the BOA Options Class, and on January 15, 2010, published a PSLRA lead plaintiff notice for the BOA Options Class on *Business Wire*. (A751-A752)

On March 15, 2010, Dornfest filed a timely motion to be appointed lead plaintiff for the BOA Options Class² (A813-A814) and Lead Plaintiffs and defendants filed briefs opposing Dornfest's motion. Significantly, in their brief filed on April 1, 2010 (A949-A965), Lead Plaintiffs (A962) argued that they had not abandoned options investors. They cited cases to support Lead Plaintiffs' argument (A960) that stock purchasers and options investors could be "members of the same class" and argued (A964) that Lead Plaintiffs should be "most capable of adequately representing the interests of class members" (emphasis added).

In an order issued April 9, 2010 (A970-A978), the district court ruled that Dornfest's action should be consolidated; that Dornfest only could pursue an individual claim; that "it is within lead plaintiff's authority to decide which claims to assert on behalf of the class" (A973, emphasis added); and that since Lead Plaintiffs "advise they are still assessing whether to assert claims on behalf of [option investors]...Lead Plaintiffs should be given the opportunity to make this decision." (A974)

At that time, neither the district court, nor Lead Plaintiffs, nor Dornfest questioned Lead Plaintiffs' standing to assert claims for the BOA

A group of option investors also moved to be appointed lead plaintiff for the BOA Options Class, but, in the face of Dornfest's larger loss, that group abandoned its motion.

Options Class. Indeed, the district court's order suggests that Lead Plaintiffs, should they have concluded it desirable, <u>could</u> assert class-wide option claims.

On May 14, 2010, defendants wrote (A979-A986) to the district court (Castel, J.), who succeeded Judge Chin upon his elevation to this Court) to note, *inter alia*, that although Dornfest had been ordered to proceed individually, defendants proposed to treat Dornfest's action as consolidated with the Securities Action and were not required to answer his complaint. On May 18, 2010, Dornfest replied (A992-A1001), arguing that the district court had not foreclosed eternally a BOA Options Class, but "deferred the issue" to provide "an opportunity for Lead Plaintiffs to assess whether to pursue a claim for the class of options investors." (A992-A993)

On May 20, 2010, the district court ordered (A1002-A1003), regarding the BOA Options Class:

By May 27, 2010, Lead Plaintiffs in the Consolidated Securities Action shall inform the Court, in writing, whether any member of the Lead Plaintiffs invested in BofA options, and if so, the amount of such investment.

(A1003) On May 27, 2010, Lead Plaintiffs responded (A1004) and stated that no Lead Plaintiff had invested in any BOA option, "but that lead plaintiffs' counsel had been retained by Grant Mitchell" ("Mitchell"), who Lead Plaintiffs' counsel stated had lost \$2,486 (namely less than one percent

of Dornfest's verified loss) in BOA options trading. Lead Plaintiffs' counsel said they were prepared to add Mitchell as a lead plaintiff which would satisfy any standing requirements, citing *Hevesi v. Citigroup*, 366 F.3d 70, 83 (2d Cir. 2004).

Then, on October 15, 2010, Lead Plaintiffs determined that BOA option claims should be asserted. They filed a Consolidated Second Amended Class Action Complaint (A1036-A1168) that alleged a class claim brought by additional Lead Plaintiff Mitchell on behalf of a class that included all BOA option investors. (A1138)

Defendants moved to dismiss that complaint and argued, *inter alia*, that Lead Plaintiffs lacked standing to assert class claims for persons who invested in BOA options other than the single January 2011 Leap Option Lead Plaintiff Mitchell had purchased. (A1203) In response, Lead Plaintiffs argued that their standing extended to all BOA option securities affected by the same alleged misstatements.

Dornfest submitted two letter briefs (A1190-A1191, A1196-A1198) in opposition to defendants' motion to dismiss the options claims on standing grounds, arguing that since his case had been consolidated with Lead Plaintiffs' case, his investments in BOA options supplied standing.

Defendants argued that Dornfest was incorrect and that his letter briefs should not be considered. (A1192-A1195, A1200-A1201)

On July 29, 2011, the district court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion to dismiss (A1202-A1226, at A1225), holding that Lead Plaintiffs lacked standing to assert class claims on behalf of BOA securities they did not purchase. Since the only BOA option a Lead Plaintiff had purchased was Mitchell's January 2011 Leap Option, the district court dismissed all of the other Lead Plaintiffs' option claims and, in a footnote (A1225, n.11), ruled that since Dornfest was not a named class representative, his options transactions did not confer standing on Lead Plaintiffs to assert class claims for investors who purchased the same BOA options as did Dornfest.

On August 4, 2011, the district court set a conference for September 7, 2011, ordered Dornfest to appear, and set a briefing schedule for issues to be raised at the conference. From August 26 through September 1, 2011, Lead Plaintiffs, defendants, and Dornfest each submitted a letter brief on Dornfest's application to move to certify the BOA Options Class. (A1227-A1230, A1232-A1234, A1235-A1236) Lead Plaintiffs stated that they did not want to add Dornfest as a Lead Plaintiff, and that Dornfest "should not

be permitted to undermine Lead Plaintiffs' decision not to name him as a class representative by bringing his own separate class action." (A1233)

On September 7, 2011, the district court held a hearing in which it seemed to acknowledge concerns about allowing Lead Plaintiffs to preclude claims for a BOA Options Class (A1237-A1275):

THE COURT: And since there would be, by definition, no overlap with the claims you've [Lead Plaintiffs] asserted, I'm having difficulty seeing how I could say you [Dornfest] can't bring a class certification motion. What he can't do is he can't say, your Honor, I'm moving, I want to be in the consolidated securities class action and I want to be one of the named plaintiffs. I agree with you. You are the fiduciaries for the class. You may not want this person in your class action. He may, for whatever reason, bring down the value of your claims, and I think you as representatives of lead plaintiff have the right to exclude him from your action.

* * *

Just as somebody's come in with derivative claims, they're in the MDL. The lead plaintiffs in the securities class action couldn't say we think it's disadvantageous that there be derivative claims in the MDL. We want to shut them down, we want to shut down the ERISA claims that were previously asserted. I don't think you can do that. (emphasis added)

(A1263-A1265)

At the September 7, 2011 hearing, the district court directed that the parties submit additional letter briefs. (A1273) From September 14 through 23, 2011, Lead Plaintiffs (A1478-A1480) and defendants (A1285-A1292)

each submitted a letter brief, and Dornfest submitted an opening and reply letter brief. (A1276-A1284, A1481-A1487)

On September 29, 2011, the district court issued its Order (A1488-A1492), holding that Dornfest was precluded from moving to certify a "class of [BOA] options holders" (A1492), reasoning, *inter alia*, that "[f]or the purposes of securities fraud action brought under the PSLRA, this distinction [between claims for which Lead Plaintiffs have standing, or lack standing], is not meaningful." (A1491)

On October 13, 2011, Dornfest filed in this Court a Petition for Permission to Appeal Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(f) seeking leave to appeal from the district court's September 29, 2011 order precluding him from moving to certify claims on behalf of a class of BOA option investors, or, alternatively, for a writ of mandamus. (A1493-A1513) Both Lead Plaintiffs and Defendants opposed Dornfest's petition. (A1514-A1540, A1541-A1555)

On March 21, 2012 (A1571-A1572), this Court (i) dismissed Dornfest's petition, without prejudice to Dornfest's right to seek certification of an interlocutory appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), because the district court's September 29, 2011 order precluding Dornfest from moving to certify the BOA Options Class "was not an 'order granting or denying class-

action certification" and (ii) denying the writ of mandamus because "the extraordinary circumstances that would warrant" mandamus were not demonstrated. (A1572)

On March 27, 2012, Dornfest moved the district court for certification of an interlocutory appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) from the district court's September 29, 2011 Order. (A1573-A1594) On April 16, 2012, the district court denied Dornfest's motion. (A1614-A1617)

On April 9, 2013, the district court entered a Judgment Approving Class Action Settlement ("Judgment"). (A2009-A2022) The Judgment incorporated by reference a Stipulation of Settlement ("Stipulation"), filed on November 30, 2012 (A1620-A1840), which provided:

...this Stipulation is intended by the Parties hereto to fully, finally and forever compromise, settle, release, resolve, relinquish, waive, discharge and dismiss with prejudice, the above-captioned consolidated securities class action (the "Action") and all claims asserted against all Defendants therein, and all Released Claims (defined below) as against the Releasees (defined below).

(A1621)

Because Dornfest's Complaint was consolidated with and into the Securities Action, the Judgment dismissing Dornfest's Complaint was with prejudice. Other than the claims belonging to January 2011 Leap Option purchasers, all other BOA Options Class claims were left untouched. The

certified class entitled to recovery in the Class Action Settlement included only common stock purchasers and the January 2011 Leap Option purchasers.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Dornfest verified his investment in 17 different BOA options and his incurred losses of \$382,890. (A830) Dornfest did not invest in the January 2011 Leap Option included in the class in the Securities Action, and was, therefore, excluded from any recovery in the Securities Action for his BOA options.

Dornfest's individual damages precluded him from pursuing his claims unless permitted to do so on a class-wide basis. For example, Lead Plaintiffs' counsel's fee application (A1923-A2003) stated that Lead Plaintiffs:

- expended over 193,500 hours prosecuting this action on behalf of the class (A1990);
- incurred, through January 31, 2013, a lodestar value of more than \$88 million (A1990);
- incurred over \$8 million in expenses (A1998) (including over \$4.4 million in expert and consultant expenses) (A1999);

- reviewed approximately 3,803,000 pages of documents produced by Defendants (A1954);
- exchanged 17 opening and rebuttal expert reports with Defendants
 (A1954); and
- took part in 61 depositions. (A1927)

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The district court erred when it concluded that whether Lead Plaintiffs had, or lacked, standing to assert the claims, was "not meaningful." (A1491). The constitutional requirement of standing is not only "meaningful," it is paramount. No court has ever held that a litigant, without standing to assert a claim, has the authority to manage, compromise or terminate another litigation asserting that claim. Yet, that is precisely what the district court held here: that Lead Plaintiffs could prevent Dornfest from seeking to certify the BOA Options Class despite the critical fact that Lead Plaintiffs lacked standing to assert those claims. *See* POINT I-A, *infra*.

The district court erred when it ruled that considerations such as the purported policies behind the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act (the "PSLRA") — efficiency, convenience, concern about lawyer-driven litigation, and the avoidance of a multiplicity of actions — should, and could, trump constitutional standing and precluded Dornfest from moving to certify

the BOA Options Class. (A1489-A1491) The district court's error was founded in its unsupported notion that the PSLRA mandated the prosecution of only a single securities class action arising out of a single factual predicate, such as the BOA acquisition of Merrill Lynch. Under this scenario, an appointed lead plaintiff would not only manage the class of securities investors for which it had standing, but would also decide the fate of investors outside of the class with whom the lead plaintiff had no cognizable legal relationship.

Nothing in the PSLRA empowers a court to bestow upon Lead Plaintiffs standing or the authority to preclude the assertion of other separate and distinct class claims, as to which Lead Plaintiffs lacked constitutional standing.³ This erroneous decision to elevate the policies purportedly underlying the PSLRA over constitutional standing had direct and adverse consequences: it permitted Lead Plaintiffs to prosecute the January 2011 Leap Option claims, while, at the same time, rendering worthless all other BOA Options Class claims. The PSLRA does not authorize, contrary to the

Indeed, one can readily imagine a scenario where an options investor or preferred shareholder suffers a massive loss and is appointed lead plaintiff. If such plaintiff does not also own common shares, the holding of the district court would permit that plaintiff to prevent purchasers of common shares from seeking any class recovery.

Constitution, lead plaintiffs to bar class claims over which lead plaintiffs lacks standing. *See* Point I-B, *infra*.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The standard of review for all issues is *de novo*. *Abrahamson v. Bd.* of Education, 374 F.3d 66, 71 (2d Cir. 2004). *See also City of Pontiac Gen. Employees' Ret. Sys. v. MBIA, Inc.*, 637 F.3d 169, 173 (2d Cir. 2011); *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc.*, 396 F.3d 96, 106, n.12 (2d Cir. 2005).

ARGUMENT

LEAD AFTER HOLDING **PLAINTIFFS** LACKED STANDING TO REPRESENT THE BOA OPTIONS CLASS, THE DISTRICT COURT **ERRED** \mathbf{BY} **DORNFEST FROM MOVING** TO **CERTIFY** THAT **CLASS**

A. The District Court Erred in Holding That Lead Plaintiffs' Lack of Standing was "Not Meaningful"

The district court erred when, despite Lead Plaintiffs' lack of standing, it empowered Lead Plaintiffs to squelch Dornfest's right under the Federal Rules to seek class certification of claims which he, and not Lead Plaintiffs, had standing to pursue. A lead plaintiff's authority to determine the boundaries of its claims, and its "control over the litigation as whole", may be co-extensive with a lead plaintiff's standing to pursue such claims, but never greater. The district court's ruling that a lead plaintiff had

authority to control all securities claims, including those it lacked standing to pursue, was erroneous.

Although Lead Plaintiffs might have been highly interested in whether or not Dornfest could represent the BOA Options Class, Lead Plaintiffs were, without standing, no more than "concerned bystanders" without a legally cognizable interest. As the Supreme Court recently stated in *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, __U.S.___, 133 S. Ct. 2652, 2663, 186 L.Ed. 2d 768, 780 (June 26, 2013):

Article III standing "is not to be placed in the hands of 'concerned bystanders,' who will use it simply as a 'vehicle for the vindication of value interests." *Diamond, 476 U. S., at 62, 106 S. Ct. 1697, 90 L. Ed. 2d 48.* No matter how deeply committed petitioners may be...or how "zealous [their] advocacy," *post,* at 4 (KENNEDY, J., dissenting), that is not a "particularized" interest sufficient to create a case or controversy under Article III. *Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U. S., at 560, 112 S. Ct. 2130, 119 L. Ed. 2d 351*, and n. 1.

The district court held that Lead Plaintiffs lacked standing to assert claims for a BOA options class (save a single option, the January 2011 Leap Option). As a result, Lead Plaintiffs lacked the ability to make decisions on behalf of investors in those options, including deciding that no BOA Options Class should be certified. *See National Super Spuds, Inc. v. New York Mercantile Exchange*, 660 F.2d 9, 17 (2d Cir. 1981) ("The most fundamental principles underlying class actions limit the powers of the representative

parties to the claims they possess in common with other members of the class."). See also Horizon Asset Mgt. Inc. v. H & R Block, 580 F.3d 755, 764 (8th Cir. 2009) ("once it was clear that Horizon would not pursue the derivative claims, it was error for the district court to abide by its decision to appoint Horizon as the sole lead plaintiff to prosecute a single consolidated complaint"). The district court's decision erroneously disregarded the bedrock constitutional requirement of standing and should be reversed.

B. Nothing in the PSLRA Cures Lead Plaintiffs' Lack of Standing

Nothing in the PSLRA gives a lead plaintiff without standing the power to prevent other class claims from being asserted. Notably, Section 27 of the PSLRA refers to a lead plaintiff's authority only with respect to the particular class that it represents. For example, the PSLRA provides that:

Not later than 90 days after the date on which a notice is published under subparagraph (A)(i), the court shall consider any motion *made by a purported class member* in response to the notice, including any motion by a class member who is not individually named as a plaintiff in the complaint or complaints, and *shall appoint as lead plaintiff the member or members of the purported plaintiff class* that the court determines to be most capable of adequately *representing the interests of class members* (hereafter in this paragraph referred to as the "most adequate plaintiff") in accordance with this subparagraph.

15 U.S.C. § 78 u-4 a(3)B(i) (emphasis added). Nothing in the PSLRA supported the district court's holding that a lead plaintiff's authority

extended to any other litigation or any other class, other than the class a lead plaintiff was appointed to represent.

Any issue of "inconvenience" or efficiency cannot confer upon Lead Plaintiffs authority to preclude claims that they lacked standing to assert. As the Supreme Court noted, matters of convenience and efficiency cannot empower a court to hear an action where standing is absent:

[W]e must put aside the natural urge to proceed directly to the merits of this important dispute and to "settle" it for the sake of convenience and efficiency. Instead, we must carefully inquire as to whether appellees have met their burden of establishing that their claimed injury is personal, particularized, concrete, and otherwise judicially cognizable.

Raines v. Byrd, 521 U.S. 811, 820 (1997); see also Hollingsworth, supra.

The district court's concern that permitting Dornfest to seek class certification would engender "a corresponding ecosystem of separate class actions" (A1491) was misplaced. In most cases, the lead plaintiff will have standing (such as to set the time periods for a class), or the lead plaintiff will add other plaintiffs so that the class has standing (*e.g.*, *Hevesi*, *supra*, 366 F.3d 70). Only in the unusual instance presented here, where Lead Plaintiffs decline to represent (what they have conceded is) a viable class of investors, will it make sense to have a separate, coordinated class.

The district court erroneously held that the distinction between (a)

Lead Plaintiffs' decision about which disclosure claims to bring, or the

temporal parameters of the class period, and (b) Lead Plaintiffs' decision that no one could assert claims for which Lead Plaintiffs lacked standing, was "not meaningful." (A1491)

Dornfest contends that because claims on behalf of options holders were dismissed on standing grounds, options holders should be evaluated differently than shareholders who fall outside of the class period or do not have a given disclosure claim brought on their behalf. For the purposes of a securities fraud class action brought under the PSLRA, this distinction is not meaningful.

(*Id*.)

The district court's September 29, 2011 (A1488-A1492) order quoted (at A1491) from Dornfest's letter brief (A1276-A1283, at A1279) that a lead plaintiff could determine the date range of the class, the particular claims asserted, the disclosures alleged to be false, and which persons should be named as individual defendants. However, the order stopped short. The District Court ignored Dornfest's next sentence that expressly addressed standing (A1279):

On the other hand, where the lead plaintiff does not represent the particular securities at issue (i.e., investors in Dornfest's seventeen options) because it lacks standing to do so, it has no authority to determine the fate of the claims these security investors may have (emphasis added).

In fact, as best we have been able to determine, no court has <u>ever</u> held that, where the lead plaintiff lacked standing to assert a claim, the lead

plaintiff nevertheless could preclude class certification for the very claim that the lead plaintiff lacked standing to assert.

The district court's reliance on then District Judge Chin's April 9, 2010 Order (A970-A975) was misplaced. In preliminarily holding that Dornfest could pursue his claim individually,⁴ then District Judge Chin explicitly permitted Lead Plaintiffs the opportunity to bring those claims (A974), apparently assuming Lead Plaintiffs' standing. That order never held that if Lead Plaintiffs lacked standing (and chose not to add additional named plaintiffs who had standing), they nevertheless could preclude another plaintiff with standing from pursuing a class claim.

In contrast to the outcome here, in cases in which a lead plaintiff was found not to have standing to bring certain claims, courts have permitted other investors with standing to bring separate, related class actions so that these investors could have their claims adjudicated. *E.g.*, *IndyMac Mortgage-Backed Sec. Litig.* No. 9 Civ. 4583 (LAK), 2011 WL 2508254, at *3-4 (June 21, 2011 S.D.N.Y.); *In re Lehman Bros. Sec. and ERISA Litig.*,

As we repeatedly represented to the district court (A1281), in a case where Lead Plaintiffs spent over \$8 million in expenses, among other things, Dornfest's individual claims, while in excess of \$300,000, were not large enough to litigate and try individually. *See Italian Colors Rest. v. Am. Express Travel Related Servs. Co.*, 667 F.3d 204 (2d Cir. 2012) *rev'd on other grounds Am. Express Co.*, v. *Italian Colors Rest.*, 133 S.Ct. 2304 (2013).

No. 08 Civ. 6762 (LAK), 2011 WL 1453790 (April 13, 2011 S.D.N.Y.); see also California Public Employees Retirement System v. The Chubb Corp., Civ. No. 00-4285 (GEB), 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27189, at 83-91 (D.N.J. 2002) (finding that where the initial class plaintiff lacked standing to assert certain securities claims, a new plaintiff with standing could assert the class claims). None of those cases held that lead plaintiffs, bereft of standing to pursue certain new claims, could preclude another plaintiff with standing from asserting those class claims.

The district court's citation (A1489-A1490) to *Hevesi v. Citigroup Inc.*, 366 F.3d 70 (2d Cir. 2004) failed to support its Order. In *Hevesi*, a lead plaintiff was given permission to avoid standing concerns by inviting additional class representatives to join that lead plaintiff's case. *Hevesi* did not hold (or even consider) the converse, namely, whether a lead plaintiff, after determining not to cure its standing deficiencies by adding additional named plaintiffs, was empowered to preclude another plaintiff with standing from bringing a class action for the claims that the lead plaintiff lacked standing to assert.

Hevesi stated, in a footnote, that it would be inefficient to have more than one plaintiff for the "same class." Hevesi, 336 F.3d at 82 n.13. Hevesi rejected the "requirement" that a different lead plaintiff be appointed "to

bring every...claim" (emphasis added). However, *Hevesi* never held that should a lead plaintiff decline to add another plaintiff to acquire standing for a claim, the plaintiff with standing to assert that claim was just out of luck. *Hevesi* never held that a lead plaintiff without standing was empowered to bar the plaintiff with standing from asserting class claims.

The concerns expressed by this Court in *Hevesi* and by the district court may be legitimate concerns, but, as a practical matter, were not present in this case. Indeed, the district court cited no instance in which, in any case, a ruling that a lead plaintiff lacked standing to assert claims for certain securities spawned another related class action, let alone an entire "ecosystem" of such actions. In most every case, lead plaintiffs have welcomed plaintiffs who provided lead plaintiffs with additional standing. *See, e.g., In re Citigroup Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 07-Civ-09901 (SHS) (S.D.N.Y.); *In re Merrill Lynch & Co. Inc. Sec., Derivative and ERISA Litig.*, 07-Civ-09633 (JSR) (S.D.N.Y.); *Miller v. Wachovia*, No. 09-Civ-06351 (RJS) (S.D.N.Y.); and *In re Royal Bank of Scotland Group PLC Sec. Litig.*, No. 09-Civ-00300 (DAB) (S.D.N.Y.)

As noted, *Hevesi* did not consider or address the particular circumstances present here and in *Chill v. Green Tree Financial Corp.*, 181 F.R.D. 398, 405-8 (D.Minn. 1998), where lead plaintiffs determined not to

undertake a plaintiff with standing. As in *Chill*, the lead plaintiff for the stock class was permitted to decline to add a plaintiff with standing to assert the options claims. The stock lead plaintiff's choice not to assert the options claims in *Chill* did not permit preclusion of the options class, but rather warranted a parallel options class. The same result should have been realized here. The district court should not have permitted the pendency of the Securities Action, headed up by Lead Plaintiffs with no standing to assert all of the BOA Options Class claims, to bar Dornfest, the plaintiff with standing to pursue those claims, from pursuing a separate coordinated class action.

_

Compare A1261-A1262 at which lead counsel said that Dornfest's supposed "unusual trading" might result in Lead Plaintiffs losing their "credibility" on their class motion, and Chill, 181 F.R.D. at 405 (where despite "potential prejudice [against the Stock Actions] posed by the additional legal hurdle for the Plaintiffs who seek compensation for option losses", a separate options class action was permitted). In subsequent briefing, Lead Plaintiffs declined to endorse that previously articulated concern and said only that they had concluded that Dornfest was not an "appropriate" lead plaintiff. Lead Plaintiffs failed to provide any explanation for their conclusion. For example, in Lead Plaintiffs' September 1, 2011 letter (A1232-A1234), they claim Dornfest would "interfere with Lead Plaintiffs' ability and authority to manage the Consolidated Securities Actions." (A1233) In a September 21, 2011 letter (A1478-A1480), Lead Plaintiffs claim Dornfest will disrupt "the litigation and Lead Plaintiffs' strategy." Neither of those "considerations" warranted the issuance of the district court's September 29, 2011 order precluding Dornfest from moving to certify the BOA Options Class.

In addition, where, as here, a district court used its power "to prevent a party from filing pleadings, motion or appeals authorized by the Federal

This Court should not endorse a lead plaintiff's sacrifice of claims it never had standing to assert. The ruling that Dornfest could not make a class motion overextended a lead plaintiff's PSLRA mandate, especially where, as here, at various times, Lead Plaintiffs determined that class option claims were viable and should be asserted and did assert them.

While the September 29, 2011 order focused on the policy of deterring "lawyer-driven litigation" (A1491), the district court made no record regarding Dornfest, and appeared to give no weight to the facts that:
(i) Mitchell had, at most, a loss of less than \$3,000, less than 1% of Dornfest's loss; (ii) following a year of investigation, Lead Plaintiffs (in their Second Amended Complaint) affirmatively asserted BOA Options Class claims thus conceding such claims' viability (A1040); (iii) Lead Plaintiff Mitchell was found to have no standing to assert any claim other than the January 2011 Leap Option claim (A1225); and (iv) the BOA Options Class was barred from the opportunity to participate in what turned

-

Rules of Civil Procedure," it has plainly committed reversible error. *Cheney v. United States District Court*, 542 U.S. 367, 380-81 (2004) ("district judge usurped power when she prevented [defendants] from filing a motion for leave to amend their answer"); *Richard Greenshields Securities, Inc. v. Lau*, 825 F.2d 647, (2d Cir. 1987) "Absent extraordinary circumstances, such as a demonstrated history of frivolous and vexatious litigation, or a failure to comply with sanctions imposed for such conduct, a court has no power to prevent a party from filing pleadings, motions or appeals authorized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure." (citations omitted)).

out to be a substantial recovery obtained for the stock and leap options class

because Dornfest was precluded from moving for class certification.

Different class actions can readily be coordinated. In this case, the

district court did a superlative job managing two different class actions

(stock and ERISA) along with a derivative action and a number of individual

actions. Coordination of one additional class action would not have been an

insurmountable hurdle⁸ and was not a reason to prevent a whole class of

investors from having their claims heard.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Judgment should be modified insofar as

it dismissed the claims of plaintiff Charles Dornfest and denied his right to

move to certify a BOA Options Class.

Dated: August 2, 2013

New York, NY

The Securities Action settled for \$2,425 billion in cash and other noncash consideration. (A1872)

Prosecution of claims on behalf of an options class should not require any repetition of discovery taken in the Securities Action. For an options

class, effective cooperation among the parties should result in little, if any,

additional discovery.

25

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED, Bragar Eagel & Squire, P.C.

By: /S/ Raymond A. Bragar Raymond A. Bragar Jeffrey H. Squire Lawrence P. Eagel 885 Third Avenue, Suite 3040 New York, New York 10022 (212) 308-5858 (ph) (212) 486-0462 (fax) bragar@bespc.com

ABBEY SPANIER, LLP

By: /S/ Judith L. Spanier
Judith L. Spanier
212 East 39th Street
New York, New York 10016
(212) 889-3700 (ph)
(212) 684-5191 (fax)
jspanier@abbeyspanier.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellant Charles Dornfest SPECIAL APPENDIX

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Memorandum and Order of the Honorable P. Kevin Castel, dated September 29, 2011, Appealed From	SPA1
Judgment Approving Class Action Settlement of the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, entered April 9, 2013, Appealed From	SPA6
Exhibit 1 to Judgment - List of Persons Excluded from the	SD 4 20
Class Pursuant to Request	SPA20 SPA76

Case 1:10-cv-00275-PKC Document 66

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC #: DATE FILED:
N RE: BANK OF AMERICA CORP. SECURITIES, DERIVATIVE, AND	
EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT (ERISA) LITIGATION	Master File No. 09 MD 2058 (PKC)
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:	MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
CHARLES N. DORNFEST,	

Plaintiff,

10 Civ. 275 (PKC)

-against-

BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants. P. KEVIN CASTEL, District Judge:

The Court previously dismissed all but one claim purportedly brought on behalf of purchasers of call options and sellers of put options on the grounds that the named, class plaintiffs in the consolidated action were without Article III standing to pursue claims directed to stock options. In re Bank of America Corp. Sec., Derivative, and Emp. Ret. Income Sec. Act (ERISA) Litig., 2011 WL 3211472, at *12-14 (S.D.N.Y. July 29, 2011). Plaintiff Charles Dornfest, an options holder, has brought a securities fraud action against defendant Bank of America Corporation ("BofA").

Domfest also seeks to represent a class of investors who held Bank of America options during the class period of September 15, 2008 through January 22, 2009. (Dornfest Compl. ¶ 1.) The lead plaintiffs oppose his effort to bring these claims as a class action. Domfest argues that because the lead plaintiffs no longer assert claims on behalf of options

Case 1:10-cv-00275-PKC Document 66 Filed 09/29/11 Page 2 of 5

holders, and because none of the named, class plaintiffs have standing to pursue such claims,

Dornfest may properly bring claims on behalf of options holders as a separate class action.

The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B)(i) (the "PSLRA"), provides that a court "shall appoint as lead plaintiff the member or members of the purported plaintiff class that the court determines to be most capable of adequately representing the interests of class members (hereafter in this paragraph referred to as the 'most adequate plaintiff')" Under the PSLRA, "the most adequate plaintiff' acts "as lead plaintiff for the consolidated actions." Id. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B)(ii). "The theory of these provisions was that if an investor with a large financial stake in the litigation was made lead plaintiff, such a plaintiff – frequently a large institution or otherwise sophisticated investor — would be motivated to act like a 'real' client, carefully choosing counsel and monitoring counsel's performance to make sure that adequate representation was delivered at a reasonable price." In re Razorfish, Inc. Sec. Litig., 143 F. Supp. 2d 304, 307 (S.D.N.Y. 2001); ; accord In re Donnkenny Inc. Sec. Litig., 171 F.R.D. 156, 157 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) (Cedarbaum, J.) (the PSLRA's lead plaintiff provision "was intended to ensure that institutional plaintiffs with expertise in the securities market and real financial interests in the integrity of the market would control the litigation, not lawyers."). I

In Hevesi v. Citigroup Inc., 366 F.3d 70, 82 n.13 (2d Cir. 2004), Judge Cabranes, writing for the panel, observed that the PSLRA's lead plaintiff provision "empower[s] one or several investors with a major stake in the litigation to exercise control over the litigation as a whole." As noted by Hevesi, the PSLRA does not require the selection of lead plaintiffs

¹ In this case, then-District Judge Chin, to whom this action was previously assigned, concluded that the State Teachers Retirement System of Ohio, the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System, the Teachers Retirement System of Texas, Stichting Pensioenfonds Zorg en Wilzijn and Fjarde AP-Fonden would serve as lead plaintiffs. (Docket # 2, at 10-17.)

Case 1:10-cv-00275-PKC Document 66 Filed 09/29/11 Page 3 of 5

"with standing to suc on every available cause of action," and permits "the addition of named plaintiffs to aid the lead plaintiff in representing a class." <u>Id.</u> at 83. Thus, where a lead plaintiff is without standing to sue on a given claim, the PSLRA allows for a mechanism whereby additional class representatives may be proposed by the lead plaintiff to pursue those claims.

In April 2010, then-District Judge Chin concluded that the lead plaintiffs had authority to decide what claims to assert against which defendants, and held that Dornfest could not commence a separate class action on behalf of options holders. (Docket # 240, at 3-6.) Judge Chin noted, among other things, that a lead plaintiff has "authority to decide what claims to assert on behalf of securities holders," and that "[p]ermitting other plaintiffs to bring additional class actions now, with additional lead plaintiffs and additional counsel, would interfere with Lead Plaintiffs' ability and authority to manage the Consolidated Securities Action." (Docket # 240, at 4-5.) He stated that "the plaintiffs in . . . <u>Dornfest</u> . . . are free to pursue their claims as individual cases – but not as class actions." (Docket # 240, at 5.)

As previously noted, since Judge Chin's order, this Court has held that the named, class plaintiffs have standing to bring claims only on behalf of holders of January 2011 call options, and dismissed all other claims on behalf of options holders. 2011 WL 3211472, at *12-14. The lead plaintiffs have not sought leave to add additional class plaintiffs or otherwise attempted to amend the complaint to revive their claims on behalf of options holders. Such tactical decisions are the prerogative of a lead plaintiff. Counsel to lead plaintiffs has stated, both on the record in open court and via letter brief, that they evaluated adding Dornfest as a class representative, and concluded that he was not well suited for that role. (Sept. 21 letter at 2; Sept. 7 Tr. at 24-26.) Such a decision is within the lead plaintiffs' prerogative "to exercise control over the litigation as a whole." Hevesi, 366 F.3d at 82, n.13.

Case 1:10-cv-00275-PKC Document 66 Filed 09/29/11 Page 4 of 5

Indeed, counsel to Dornfest acknowledge that the lead plaintiffs have the authority and discretion to determine which claims to pursue:

There is no dispute that lead plaintiffs for a class of common shareholders can determine, for example, whether that class should bring a Section 11 claim; whether or not to assert that a certain corporate disclosure was actionable; or whether the class should bring claims against a particular individual. . . . Similarly, if Lead Plaintiffs decide upon a particular date range for the common shareholder class, no other shareholder can bring a class action with respect to different time periods.

(Sept. 14 Letter at 4.) In each of those instances, a lead plaintiff necessarily makes determinations that limit the class of shareholders. Inevitably, any class definition establishes boundaries as to who may recover. Individuals excluded from the class may pursue individual claims, as Judge Chin recognized in his order of April 2010. (Docket # 240, at 5.)

Domfest contends that because claims on behalf of options holders were dismissed on standing grounds, options holders should be evaluated differently than shareholders who fall outside of the class period or do not have a given disclosure claim brought on their behalf. For the purposes of a securities fraud class action brought under the PSLRA, this distinction is not meaningful. As Judge Cabranes noted in Hevesi, a lead plaintiff may seek to incorporate additional named class plaintiffs in order to resolve any standing concerns. 366 F.3d at 83. In the framework proposed by Domfest, any consolidated securities fraud class action might then carry with it a corresponding ecosystem of separate class actions seeking relief on behalf of securities holders whose claims vary from the lead plaintiffs. Domfest's approach invites the type of lawyer-driven litigation that the PSLRA seeks to avoid, and would likely promote near-endless skirmishes about securities holders who fall outside a class definition and the degree to which their exclusion implicates matters of standing.

Case 13-1677, Document 82, 08/02/2013, 1007048, Page40 of 112

Case 1:10-cv-00275-PKC Document 66 Filed 09/29/11 Page 5 of 5

Therefore, consistent with Judge Chin's ruling of April 2010 and Hevesi, this

Court concludes that Dornfest may not assert claims on behalf of a class of options holders. He
remains free to pursue his claims individually.

SO ORDERED.

P. Kevin Castel

United States District Judge

Dated: New York, New York

September 29, 2011

Gase 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 1-4605, Y.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

IN RE BANK OF AMERICA CORP. SECURITIES, DERIVATIVE, AND EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT (ERISA) LITIGATION

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
Consolidated Securities Action

Master File No. 09 MDL 2058 (PKC)

ECF CASE

USDS SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: $\frac{4-q-13}{}$

JUDGMENT APPROVING CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

WHEREAS, a consolidated securities action is pending in this Court entitled In re Bank of America Corp. Securities, Derivative and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation, No. 09 MDL 2058 (PKC) (S.D.N.Y.) (the "Action");

WHEREAS, by Memorandum and Order dated February 6, 2012, this Court certified the Action to proceed as a class action on behalf of a class of investors consisting of: (i) as to claims under Sections 14(a) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act"), all persons and entities who held Bank of America Corporation ("BoA") common stock as of October 10, 2008, and were entitled to vote on the merger between BoA and Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. ("Merrill"), and were damaged thereby; and (ii) as to claims under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act, all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired BoA common stock during the period from September 18, 2008 through January 21, 2009, inclusive, excluding shares of BoA common stock acquired by exchanging stock of Merrill for BoA stock through the merger between the two companies consummated on January 1, 2009, and were damaged thereby; and (iii) as to claims under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Exchange Act, all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired January 2011 call options of BoA from September 18, 2008 through January 21, 2009, inclusive, and were damaged thereby; and (iv) as

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 2 of 65

to claims under Sections 11, 12(a)(2), and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (the "Securities Act"), all persons and entities who purchased BoA common stock issued under the Registration Statement and Prospectus for the BoA common stock offering that occurred on or about October 7, 2008, and were damaged thereby (the "Class");

WHEREAS, unless otherwise defined in this Judgment, the capitalized terms herein shall have the same meaning as they have in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated November 30, 2012 (the "Stipulation");

WHEREAS, pursuant to this Court's Order dated February 29, 2012, the Notice of Pendency of Class Action (the "Class Notice") was mailed to potential members of the Class to notify them of, among other things: (i) the Action pending against the Defendants; (ii) the certification of the Action by the Court to proceed as a class action on behalf of the Court-certified Class; and (iii) their right to request to be excluded from the Class, the effect of remaining in the Class or requesting exclusion, and the requirements for requesting exclusion;

WHEREAS, Lead Plaintiffs, the State Teachers Retirement System of Ohio; the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System; the Teacher Retirement System of Texas; Stichting Pensioenfonds Zorg en Welzijn, represented by PGGM Vermogensbeheer B.V.; and Fjärde AP-Fonden, individually and on behalf of the Court-certified Class, and defendants BoA, Merrill, Kenneth D. Lewis, John A. Thain, Joe L. Price, Neil A. Cotty, Banc of America Securities LLC, Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Incorporated, William Barnet III, Frank P. Bramble, Sr.,

Excluded from the Class by definition are: Defendants, present or former executive officers of BoA and Merrill, present or former members of Merrill's and BoA's Board of Directors and their immediate family members (as defined in 17 C.F.R. § 229.404, Instructions). Also excluded from the Class are any Persons who previously submitted a request for exclusion as set forth on Appendix 1 to the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated November 30, 2012 who have not opted-back into the Class. All Persons excluded from the Class pursuant to request are set forth on Exhibit 1 hereto.

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 3 of 65

John T. Collins, Gary L. Countryman, Tommy R. Franks, Charles K. Gifford, Monica C. Lozano, Walter E. Massey, Thomas J. May, Patricia E. Mitchell, Thomas M. Ryan, O. Temple Sloan, Jr., Meredith R. Spangler, Robert L. Tillman, and Jackie M. Ward (collectively, the "Defendants" and, together with Lead Plaintiffs, the "Parties") entered into the Stipulation, which was approved by additional named plaintiff Grant Mitchell (together with Lead Plaintiffs, the "Class Representatives"), setting forth the terms and conditions of the Parties' proposed settlement (the "Settlement");

WHEREAS, by Order dated December 4, 2012 (the "Preliminary Approval Order"), this Court (a) preliminarily approved the Settlement; (b) ordered that notice of the proposed Settlement be provided to potential Class Members; (c) provided Class Members with the opportunity to: (i) opt-back into the Class if they previously submitted a request for exclusion from the Class in connection with the Class Notice, or (ii) object to the proposed Settlement; and (d) scheduled a hearing regarding final approval of the Settlement;

WHEREAS, due and adequate notice has been given to the Class;

WHEREAS, the Court conducted a hearing on April 5, 2013 (the "Settlement Hearing") to consider, among other things, (i) whether the terms and conditions of the Settlement are fair, reasonable and adequate, and in the best interests of Lead Plaintiffs and the other Class Members, and should therefore be approved; and (ii) whether a judgment should be entered dismissing the Action with prejudice as against the Defendants; and

WHEREAS, the Court having reviewed and considered the Stipulation, all papers filed and proceedings held herein in connection with the Settlement, all oral and written comments received regarding the Settlement, including the objections filed with respect thereto, and the record in the Action, and good cause appearing therefor;

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 4 of 65

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

- 1. <u>Jurisdiction</u> The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Λction, and all matters relating to the Settlement, as well as personal jurisdiction over all of the Parties and each of the Class Members.
- 2. <u>Incorporation of Settlement Documents</u> This Judgment incorporates and makes a part hereof: (a) the Stipulation filed with the Court on November 30, 2012; and (b) the Settlement Notice and the Summary Notice, both of which were filed with the Court on February 19, 2013.
- Settlement Notice The Court finds that the dissemination of the Settlement 3. Notice and the publication of the Summary Notice: (i) were implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (ii) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (iii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members (a) of the effect of the Settlement (including the Releases provided for therein), (b) of Co-Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of Litigation Expenses, (c) of their right to object to any aspect of the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, and/or Co-Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and reimbursement of Litigation Expenses, (d) of their right to opt-back into the Class if they previously submitted a request for exclusion in connection with the Class Notice, and (e) of their right to appear at the Settlement Hearing; (iv) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons or entities entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (v) satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(7), 15 U.S.C. § 77z-1(a)(7), and all other applicable law and rules.

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 5 of 65

- 4. Final Settlement Approval and Dismissal of Claims Pursuant to, and in accordance with, Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court hereby fully and finally approves the Settlement set forth in the Stipulation in all respects (including, without limitation: the amount of the Settlement; the Releases provided for therein, including the release of the Released Lead Plaintiffs' Claims as against the Defendants' Releasees; and the dismissal with prejudice of claims against Defendants), and finds that the Settlement is, in all respects, fair, reasonable and adequate, and is in the best interests of Lead Plaintiffs and the other Class Members. The Parties are directed to implement, perform and consummate the Settlement in accordance with the terms and provisions contained in the Stipulation.
- 5. The Action and all of the claims against Defendants by Lead Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are hereby dismissed with prejudice. The Parties shall bear their own costs and expenses, except as otherwise expressly provided in the Stipulation.
- 6. <u>Binding Effect</u> The terms of the Stipulation and of this Judgment shall be forever binding on the Defendants, Lead Plaintiffs and all other Class Members (regardless of whether or not any individual Class Member submits a Proof of Claim Form or seeks or obtains a distribution from the Net Settlement Fund), as well as their respective heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, affiliates and assigns. The Persons listed on Exhibit 1 hereto are excluded from the Class pursuant to request and are not bound by the terms of the Stipulation or this Judgment.
- 7. Releases The releases as set forth in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Stipulation, together with the definitions contained in paragraph 1 of the Stipulation relating thereto, are expressly incorporated herein in all respects. Accordingly, this Court orders that:

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 6 of 65

- (a) Without further action by anyone, and subject to paragraphs 8 and 9 below, upon the Effective Date of the Settlement, Lead Plaintiffs, Class Representatives, and each of the other Class Members, on behalf of themselves, their heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, affiliates and assigns, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, discharged and dismissed each and every Released Lead Plaintiffs' Claim against the Defendants and the other Defendants' Releasees and shall forever be enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Lead Plaintiffs' Claims against any of Defendants' Releasees. This Release shall not apply to any Person listed on Exhibit 1 hereto.
- below, upon the Effective Date of the Settlement, each of the Defendants and each of the other Defendants' Releasees, on behalf of themselves, their heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, affiliates and assigns, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, discharged and dismissed each and every Released Defendants' Claim against all of the Lead Plaintiffs' Releasees and shall forever be enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Defendants' Claims against any of the Lead Plaintiffs' Releasees. This Release shall not apply to any Person listed on Exhibit 1 hereto.
- 8. Notwithstanding $\P\P$ 7(a) (b) above, nothing in this Judgment shall bar any action by any of the Parties to enforce or effectuate the terms of the Stipulation or this Judgment.
- 9. Notwithstanding \P 7(a) (b) above, nothing in this Judgment shall release any of the Excluded Claims (as that term is defined within paragraph 1(uu) of the Stipulation).

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 7 of 65

- 10. <u>Corporate Governance Enhancements</u> The Corporate Governance Enhancements as set forth in paragraphs 36 and 37 of the Stipulation are expressly incorporated herein in all respects. Accordingly, this Court orders that:
- (a) BoA will, within forty-five (45) days following the entry of this Judgment, implement the following Corporate Governance Enhancements, and will maintain such Corporate Governance Enhancements through the later of January 1, 2015 or eighteen (18) months following entry of this Judgment.
- (i) BoA will amend Section 3 of its Corporate Governance Guidelines to read, in relevant part, as follows:

"Majority Voting for Directors. In an uncontested election, a director who fails to receive the required number of votes for re-election in accordance with the Bylaws shall offer to resign. In addition, a director whose resignation is under consideration shall abstain from participating in any recommendation or decision regarding that resignation. The Corporate Governance Committee shall make a recommendation to the Board as to whether to accept or reject the tendered resignation, or whether other action should be taken. The Corporate Governance Committee and the Board, in making their decisions, may consider any factor or other information that they deem relevant. The Board shall act on the tendered resignation, taking into account the Corporate Governance Committee's recommendation, and shall publicly disclose its decision regarding the resignation and the basis for the decision within ninety (90) days after the results of the election are certified. If the resignation is not accepted, the director will continue to serve until the next annual meeting of stockholders and until the director's successor is elected and qualified. The Board shall not permit the director to stand for election at the next annual meeting."

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 8 of 65

(ii) BoA will amend Section 8 of its Corporate Governance Guidelines to read, in relevant part, as follows:

"Minimum Stock Ownership by Executive Officers and Directors. In order to align the interests of the Company's executive officers and directors with those of the Company's stockholders, the Board has adopted the following minimum stock ownership requirements: (a) the Chief Executive Officer shall hold at least 500,000 shares of the Company's common stock and retain at least 50% of the net after-tax shares from future equity awards until retirement; (b) other executive officers shall hold at least 300,000 shares of the Company's common stock and retain at least 50% of the net after-tax shares from future equity awards until the ownership guideline is achieved; and (c) non-management directors are required to hold and cannot sell the restricted stock they receive as compensation (except as necessary to pay taxes upon vesting) until termination of their service. The Company shall disclose in its annual proxy statement any failure of any director to comply with the stock ownership guidelines. All full value shares and units beneficially owned by executive officers and directors are included in the calculation; performance contingent shares and units are included in the calculation when earned; and stock options are not included. Newly appointed executive officers will have up to five years to achieve compliance."

(iii) In connection with the establishment of the Corporate Development Committee, BoA will amend the charter for the Corporate Development Committee to read, in relevant part, as follows:

"Committee Authority and Responsibilities. In carrying out its oversight responsibilities as set forth above, the Committee shall oversee senior management's establishment of policies and guidelines, to be adopted by the Board, establishing appropriate

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 9 of 65

Applicable Transactions are vetted carefully and that adequate due diligence is performed prior to Board approval of any Applicable Transaction. Among other things, the Committee shall ensure that the Chief Executive Officer and the Board are informed with respect to any bonus or incentive compensation agreements with an actual or estimated aggregate value exceeding 5% of the acquisition price at the time the Applicable Transaction is announced, which agreements have been negotiated in connection with an Applicable Transaction and are based on or otherwise related to such Applicable Transaction. In connection with any Applicable Transaction to be submitted to the Board for approval, the Committee shall meet at least once, telephonically or in person, with members of senior management to review management's compliance with applicable policies and procedures related to the Company's consideration of the Applicable Transaction, prior to its presentation to the Board for approval."

- (b) BoA will maintain the following corporate governance reforms (agreed to previously with the SEC) through January 1, 2015:
 - (i) that all compensation committee members be super-independent;
- (ii) that BoA publish on its website the incentive compensation principles and the requirement that it adhere to them;
- (iii) that BoA have its Chief Executive and Chief Financial Officers certify that they have reviewed all annual and merger proxy statements;
- (iv) that BoA maintain a consultant to the Compensation Committee who would report solely to the Compensation Committee and would be "independent" under all applicable NYSE rules and guidelines concerning compensation consultants; and

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 10 of 65

- (v) that BoA provide shareholders with an annual non-binding "say on pay"with respect to executive compensation,
- (c) The Court shall retain jurisdiction until the end-date of the Corporate Governance Enhancements on the later of January 1, 2015 or eighteen (18) months following entry of this Judgment to enforce any of the conditions set forth in this paragraph 10.

11. Complete Bar Order -

- Any and all Persons are permanently barred, enjoined and restrained, to (a) the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, from commencing, prosecuting or asserting any claim for indemnity or contribution against any Defendants' Releasees (or any other claim against any Defendants' Releasees where the alleged injury to such Person is that Person's actual or threatened liability to the Class or a Class Member in the Action), based upon, arising out of or related to the Released Lead Plaintiffs' Claims, whether arising under state, federal or foreign law, as claims, cross-claims, counterclaims, or third-party claims, whether asserted in the Action, in this Court, in any federal or state court, or in any other court, arbitration proceeding, administrative agency, or other forum in the United States or elsewhere. However, with respect to any judgment that the Class or a Class Member may obtain against such Person based upon, arising out of or relating to any Released Lead Plaintiffs' Claim belonging to the Class or a Class Member, that Person shall be entitled to a credit of the greater of (i) an amount that corresponds to the percentage of responsibility of the Defendants for the loss to the Class or the Class Member or (ii) the amount paid by or on behalf of the Defendants to the Class or the Class Member for common damages.
- (b) Except as provided in ¶ 11(d) below, each and every one of Defendants'
 Releasees is hereby permanently barred, enjoined and restrained, to the fullest extent permitted

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 11 of 65

by applicable law, from commencing, prosecuting or asserting any claim for indemnity or contribution against any Person (or any other claim against any such Person where the alleged injury to such Defendants' Releasee is that Defendants' Releasee's actual or threatened liability to the Class or a Class Member in the Action), based upon, arising out of or related to the Released Lead Plaintiffs' Claims, whether arising under state, federal, or foreign law, as claims, cross-claims, counterclaims, or third-party claims, whether asserted in the Action, in this Court, in any other federal or state court, or in any other court, arbitration proceeding, administrative agency, or other forum in the United States or elsewhere.

- (c) Nothing in this Complete Bar Order shall prevent any Person listed on Exhibit 1 hereto from pursuing any Released Lead Plaintiffs' Claim against any Defendants' Releasees. If any such Person pursues any such Released Lead Plaintiffs' Claim against any Defendants' Releasees, nothing in this Complete Bar Order or in the Stipulation shall operate to preclude such Defendants' Releasees from asserting any claim of any kind against such Person, including any Released Defendants' Claims (or seeking contribution or indemnity from any Person, including any co-Defendant in the Action, in respect of the claim of such Class Member who is excluded from the Class pursuant to request as set forth on Exhibit 1 hereto.
- (d) Notwithstanding anything in sub-paragraphs 11(a)-(c) above, nothing in the Stipulation or in sub-paragraphs 11(a)-(c) above shall operate to (a) preclude the Defendants' Releasees from asserting any claims against their own insurers; or (b) preclude the Defendants or any other Person from asserting any claims, including claims for contribution or indemnity, against any Person, including any Defendant in this Action, in connection with or arising out of the Excluded Claims (as that term is defined within paragraph 1(uu) of the Stipulation).

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 12 of 65

12. Rule 11 Findings - The Court finds and concludes that the Parties and their respective counsel have complied in all respects with the requirements of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in connection with the commencement, maintenance, prosecution, defense and settlement of the Action.

- 13. <u>No Admissions</u> Neither this Judgment, nor the Term Sheet, nor the Stipulation (whether or not consummated) nor the negotiation of the Stipulation, nor any proceedings taken pursuant thereto:
- (a) shall be offered against any of the Defendants' Releasees as evidence of, or construed as, or deemed to be evidence of any presumption, concession, or admission by any of the Defendants' Releasees with respect to the truth of any fact alleged by Lead Plaintiffs or the validity of any claim that was or could have been asserted or the deficiency of any defense that has been or could have been asserted in this Action or in any litigation, or of any liability, negligence, fault, or other wrongdoing of any kind of any of the Defendants' Releasees;
- (b) shall be offered against any of the Lead Plaintiffs' Releasees, as evidence of a presumption, concession or admission with respect to any liability, negligence, fault or wrongdoing of any kind, or in any way referred to for any other reason as against any of the Lead Plaintiffs' Releasees, in any civil, criminal or administrative action or proceeding, other than such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of the Stipulation; provided, however, that if the Stipulation is approved by the Court, the Parties and the Releasees and their respective counsel may refer to it to effectuate the protections from liability granted hereunder or otherwise to enforce the terms of the Settlement;

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 13 of 65

- (c) shall be construed against any of the Releasees as an admission, concession, or presumption that the consideration to be given hereunder represents the amount which could be or would have been recovered after trial; or
- (d) shall be construed against any of the Lead Plaintiffs' Releasees as an admission, concession, or presumption that any of their claims are without merit, that any of the Defendants' Releasees had meritorious defenses, or that damages recoverable under the Second Amended Complaint would not have exceeded the Settlement Amount.
- Netention of Jurisdiction Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, this Court retains continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over: (a) the Parties for purposes of the administration, interpretation, implementation and enforcement of the Settlement; (b) the disposition of the Settlement Fund; (c) any motion for an award of attorneys' fees and/or Litigation Expenses by Co-Lead Counsel in the Action that will be paid from the Settlement Fund; (d) any motion to approve the Plan of Allocation; (e) any motion to approve the Class Distribution Order; and (f) the Class Members for all matters relating to the Action.
- 15. Separate orders shall be entered regarding approval of a plan of allocation and the motion of Co-Lead Counsel for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of Litigation Expenses. Such orders shall in no way affect or delay the finality of this Judgment and shall not affect or delay the Effective Date of the Settlement.
- 16. <u>Modification of the Agreement of Settlement</u> Without further approval from the Court, Lead Plaintiffs and Defendants are hereby authorized to agree to and adopt such amendments or modifications of the Stipulation or any exhibits attached thereto to effectuate the Settlement that: (i) are not materially inconsistent with this Judgment; and (ii) do not materially limit the rights of Class Members in connection with the Settlement. Without further order of

Case 13-1677, Document 82 08/02/2013, 1007048, Page54 of 112

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 14 of 65

the Court, Lead Plaintiffs and Defendants may agree to reasonable extensions of time to carry

out any provisions of the Settlement.

Termination - If the Effective Date does not occur or the Settlement is 17.

terminated as provided in the Stipulation, then this Judgment (and any orders of the Court

relating to the Settlement) shall be vacated, rendered null and void and be of no further force or

effect, except as otherwise provided by the Stipulation. Within fourteen (14) business days after

joint written notification of termination is sent by counsel for BoA and Co-Lead Counsel to the

Escrow Agent pursuant to the terms of the Escrow Agreement, the Settlement Fund (including

accrued interest thereon and any funds received by Co-Lead Counsel consistent with ¶ 19 of the

Stipulation), less any expenses and any costs which have either been disbursed or incurred and

chargeable to Notice and Administration Costs and less any Taxes paid or due or owing shall be

refunded by the Escrow Agent to BoA. In the event that the funds received by Co-Lead Counsel

consistent with ¶ 19 of the Stipulation have not been refunded to the Settlement Fund within the

fourteen (14) business days specified in this paragraph, those funds shall be refunded by the

Escrow Agent to BoA immediately upon their deposit into the Escrow Account consistent with

¶ 19 of the Stipulation.

18. Entry of Final Judgment - There is no just reason to delay the entry of this

Judgment as a final judgment in this Action. Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court is expressly

directed to immediately enter this final judgment in this Action.

SO ORDERED this gt day of April, 2013.

The Honorable P. Kevin Castel

United States District Judge

686669

14

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 15 of 65

EXHIBIT 1

Persons Excluded from the Class Pursuant to Request

- 1976 Real Estate Trust UTA DTD 12/28/76 FBO Richard Finger Houston, TX
- 2. The 1991 Jeffrey R. Parker Family Trust Englewood, NJ
- The 1994 Drew E. Parker Family Trust Englewood, NJ
- 4. The 1994 Julie P. Mantell Family Trust Memphis, TN
- 2008 SRG Trust New York, NY
- Benjamin and Caroline Abrams
 Educational Trust
 San Francisco, CA
- Zachary Abrams
 San Francisco, CA

- Martha B. Adair Revocable Trust, Barbara A. Roach, Trustee Boulder, CO
- Melvin L. Adams Federalsburg, MD
- 10. John R. Agnew Fort Myers, FL
- Harry J. and Patricia N. Agoff
 Tr UA 08-APR-97 Harry J. Agoff
 and Patricia N. Agoff Revocable
 Trust
 San Matco, CA
- 12. Dene Miller Alden, Trustee The Dolores E. Miller Trust Cincinnati, OH
- 13. Peter P. Alessandro Clifton Park, NY
- 14. Darlene P. Allen (IRA) Clarksburg, MD

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 16 of 65

15.	Srinivasa R. Allu Quincy, MA	23.	Donald Arkley Redwood City, CA
16.	Anita L. Altheide TTEE Charles R. Altheide TTEE Anita L. Altheide Living Trust U/A DTD 06/12/97 Hannibal, MO	24.	Robert Arndt TR UA 07/26/1990 Redington Shores, FL
17.	Ambassador Life Insurance Company Houston, TX	25.	Margaret Arsenault; Margaret Arsenault & Edward Arsenault, JT TEN Stow, MA
18.	Amundi c/o DRRT Miami, FL	26.	Anna H. Ashby Churchville, VA
19.	Ronald R. Anderson Lincoln, NE	27.	James C. Atkins & Leola T. Atkins Richmond, VA
20.	Wilma Anderson Keosauqua, IA	28.	Barbara H. Babcock & Arthur E. Babcock Carmel Valley, CA
21.	Anne Duchess of Westminster's Charity Eccleston Chester, England	29.	Richard J. Babiars Auburn, NY
22.	Michel G. Araman & Adele C. Araman Buena Park, CA	30.	Robert J. Baldes, Sr. Albany, NY

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 17 of 65

31.	William Proctor Ball Grifton, NC	39.	Doreen C. Barrows Leesburg, FL
32.	Grace Louise Baltusnik Charlotte, NC	40.	Charles R. Bassett Newton Highlands, MA
33.	Banque Genevoise de Gestion SA on behalf of its clients Geneve, Switzerland	41.	Gerald D. Bastin & Wendy Bastin Arden, NC
34.	Barbara Barbaria San Francisco, CA	42.	Dorothy Anne Bayliss Charlotte, NC
35.	Brian Barbaria San Francisco, CA	43.	F. James Becher, Jr. Greensboro, NC
36.	Janet D. Barker Black Diamond, WA	44.	Robert Beck Boothwyn, PA
37.	Melvin K. Barneko & Alice M. Barneko, JT TEN Valparaiso, IN	45.	Elizabeth Jeannette Beighau Temple City, CA
38.	John Baron and Etta Baron Newtown, PA	46.	Fannie Bond Bellamy Windsor, NC

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 18 of 65

47.	Merle Bellis Ellensburg, WA	55,	James K. Biggs, Jr. Houston, TX
48.	Verna E. Belmer Citrus Heights, CA	56.	Emily Boell Corona, CA
49.	Robert Faro Belport & Christine E. Belport JT TEN Green Bay, WI	57.	Joan Elaine Boone Berkeley, CA
50.	Melvin Belsky Alamo, CA	58.	Joseph Borello New York, NY
51.	James Thomas Benge & Elizabeth Benge TR UA Nov. 18, 1992 The Benge Revocable Trust Pryor, OK	59.	Louise M. Botica Debary, FL
52.	Joyce J. Berdal & Raymond J. Berdal JT TEN Madison, WI	60.	Merle Lee Bourn (Roth IRA) La Grange, IL
53,	Janet T. Berrier Groton, VT	61.	Thomas David Bourne, MD Charlottesville, VA
54.	Mark L. Bigelow Mifflintown, PA	62.	Margaret A. Bowden (Roth IRA) North Providence, RI

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 19 of 65

63.	Thomas H. Bowden North Providence, Rl	71.	Iva H. Brown Nashville, TN
64.	Donald C. Boyer Oakville, IA	72.	Katherine Ann Brown Litchfield Park, AZ
65.	Jeannette Bragg Enfield, CT	73.	Margaret Brown Montrose, CO
66.	Anne M. Braisted, Trustee Paul W. Braisted Family Trust Columbia, MO	74.	Donald Brunell Walnut Creek, CA
67.	James H. Brammer, Jr. Lynchburg, VA	75.	Lillian F. Brunell Livingston, NJ
68.	Preston R. Branksy & Zena Bransky Glencoe, IL	76.	Roy Lewis Bubb St. Petersburg, FL
69.	Sherry Philippet Brewster Newport, WA	77.	Charles F. Buckland & Carol J. Buckland Alexander, NC
70.	Adelina M. Bride Portland, OR	78.	Robert W. Buckner Floral Park, NY

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 20 of 65

79.	D. Landon Buffington Smyrna, GA	87.	Ronald Wayne Campbell Jackson, MI
80.	Ilya Burlak Marlboro, NJ	88.	J. Alex Canepari Memphis, TN
81.	George A. Burton, Jr. Rocky Mount, NC	89.	Giuseppe Caprio & Eva Caprio Bologna, Italy
82.	Estate of Robert D. Busch Sunnyvale, CA	90.	Vincent Carlson Bloomington, IL
83.	John A. Bushong Arlington, VA	91.	The Carnegie Family Trust U/A DTD 09/02/98 James & Susan Carnegie TTEES Minden, NV
84.	Jean Sueanne Butler Atlanta, GA	92.	Hilda M. Carter & John M. Carter (deceased) Jackson, GA
85.	Martha Butterfield Chattanooga, TN	93.	Bill Sweeney Castillo Trust, Willard S. Sweeney, Trustee Roscommon, MI
86.	Michael A. Cahoon Engelhard, NC	94.	Nancy A. Castleberry Winton, CA

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 21 of 65

95.	Marie G. Catanese Estero, FL	103.	Hetty Chong & Russell Chong Oakland, CA
96.	Jane L. Caviglia Visalia, CA	104.	Razzakul H. Chowdhury San Luis Obispo, CA
97.	Shirley M. Cawley Aurora, IL	105.	Lenore C. Christel Manitowoc, WI
98.	Caroline Chan Murrieta, CA	106.	Josephine Ciufo Greece, NY
99.	Carmen Chavez-Lopez Pico Rivera, CA	107.	Elcanor Clements, Trustee UA 19-April-95 Eleanor Clements Living Trust Norwood, NJ
100.	Andrew Cheesman Newburgh, NY	108	. David R. Clinton Bullhead City, AZ
101	Frances R. Cherry TTEE FBO Frances R. Cherry Trust U/A/D 8/26/91 Spartanburg, SC	109	. Marguerite S. Cockey Dec'd TR Marguerite S. Cockey Trust Barbara C. Thompson, Executor Modesto, CA
102	. Chickasaw Foundation Ada, OK	110	Cheryl Coddington Jupiter, FL

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 22 of 65

111. Philip M. Comerford, Trustee Trust U/A DTD 4/30/1926 by Percival Smith Hill II Naples, FL	119. Wheirda M. Cooper Magnolia, AR
112. John Consolo Hawthorne, NJ	120. J. Robert Corson Cottonwood, AZ
113. Frank B. Contratto Aurora, IL	121. Harold D. Cox & Marilyn E. Fisher Hubbard, OR
114. Glen Dale Conway & Elvira Conway St. Louis, MO	122. Charles K. Craig Charlotte, NC
115. Robert P. Cook, Jr. Lafayette, CA	123. Ann Elizabeth Craven North Wilkesboro, NC
116. Bruce Cook Westwood, MA	124. Cyril E. Crawley Glocester, RI
117. Charlotte C. Cook (deceased) Lafayette, CA	125. Ann Crossland Pasadena, CA
118. Vergie Cooper Wilmington, DE	126. Robert E. Crowder & Dorothy A. Crowder TR UA 5/29/91 Crowder Family Trust Carson City, NV

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 23 of 65

127.	Oscar E. Cruz Pinole, CA	135.	Brian L. Daves Charlotte, NC
128.	Thomas L. Curth Indio, CA	136.	Gloria M. Davies Bryans Road, MD
129.	Dade T. Curtis Dunlap, IL	137.	Dorothy M. Davis Nanjemoy, MD
130.	Deanna M. Dack Oakley, CA	138.	Kenneth J. Davis San Diego, CA
131.	Marion E. Dalbey Grover Beach, CA	139.	Martha Ann Davis Fresno, CA
132.	Robert Daniel Huntington Beach, CA	140.	Patricia R. Davis Manchester, NH
133.	Darrow Family Bypass Trust Elk Grove, CA	141.	Thomas Lee Davis Seal Beach, CA
134	Leslie Lamont Darrow (deceased) & H. Marie Darrow (deceased) & their survivors Elk Grove, CA	142.	. Bruck Dawit Annandale, VA

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 24 of 65

143. Roy E. Day Decatur, GA	151. Peter R. Disciascio & Joyce M. Disciascio, JT WROS Ocean City, NJ
144. Joyce Kathleen Debusk	152. Thelma D. Domenicone
Glade Spring, VA	San Fernando, CA
145. Anita Degreef Sint-Pieters-Leeuw, Belgium	153. Betty P. Donohoe Fairfax, VA
146. Deka International Luxemburg S.A. Luxembourg	154. Taso E. Dontchos Centennial, CO
147. Deka Investment GmbH	155. Gertrude M. Doody
Frankfurt, Germany	Arlington, MA
148. Robert L. Deleeuw	156. Kathleen L. Dooley Maley
Kalamazoo, MI	Indian Trail, NC
149. Estate of Mamie A. Delzell	157. William S. Dorsey
Pawleys Island, SC	Owings Mills, MD
150. Frances A. White DeSear	158. Laura Dawn Doscher
Brandon, FL	Rockville, MD

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 25 of 65

159.	Helen M. Douglas Fairport, NY	167.	Jason Dupuis Berlin, MD
160.	Dan C. Doyle Torrance, CA	168.	John F. Duran, Jr. & Ruth M. Duran, JT TEN Woburn, MA
161.	Donie B. Driver Commerce, GA	169.	Elizabeth L. Dyer, TTEE Elizabeth L. Dyer Rev Trust UAD 4/27/07 St. Paul, MO
162.	Estate of Adeline A. Duecker Madison, WI	170.	Lisa F. Dylan & Gary F. David, Trustees, David Revocable Intervivos Trust Fred David (deceased) Sacramento, CA
163.	Dorothy A. Duffy Irmo, SC	171.	Virgie L. Earl Sun City Center, FL
164.	Dorothy Dufner Sun Lakes, AZ	172.	Alireza Ebrahim (aka Ali R. Ebrahimi) & Tahereh Jamshidi Falls Church, VA
165	Walter Dufner Sun Lakes, AZ	173.	Mary L. Edmonds Union City, CA
166	Buri Duncan Linville, NC	174	. Robert Elkins New Glarus, WI

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 26 of 65

175.	Wayne Ellithorpe, TTEE & Annette Marie Ellithorpe, TTEE Prescott, AZ	183.	Estate of Lillian H. Falk Camp Hill, PA
176.	Marlyn S. Eltanal TR UA 07-OCT-82 Eltanal Family Residual Trust Scottsdale, AZ	184.	Ernest Farmer & Caroline W. Farmer Silver Springs, FL
177.	Joyce Empson Scio, NY	185.	Alvin J. Faulkner Corinth, TX
178.	EOSCO (nominee partnership), by Margaret K. Gutmann, General Partner Middletown, CT	186.	Lorraine Ferrall Simi Valley, CA
179.	Irmgard Erickson Arlington, VA	187.	Ann S. Ficatier Poissy, France
180.	Frances P. Eriksen Sun City West, AZ	188.	Jeremy Fineberg Cedarhurst, NY
181.	Susan F. Evans & Nancy F. Henderek, Trustees Weston P. Figgins Trust U/A DTD 2/9/1989 Peabody, MA	189.	Martin Fineberg Teaneck, NJ
182.	James L. Faircloth & MaeLynn Faircloth Statesville, NC	190.	Finger Interests Number One, Ltd. Houston, TX

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 27 of 65

191. Richard B. Finger	199. Judith M. Flynn
Houston, TX	Corvallis, OR
192. Marie M. Fiorella	200. Viola Fogg
Glen Rock, NJ	North Berwick, ME
193. Walter C. Fisch & Ann G. Fisch, Joint Acet with Rights of Survivorship Savannah, GA	201. Dan B. Foland Wilmington, OH
194. Estate of Louis H. Flanders East Amherst, NY	202. Bruce Forsberg Escondido, CA
195. Angela M. Flanery	203. Robert L. Freeman
Louisville, KY	Allentown, NJ
196. Robert E. Fletcher, Ramona I. Fletcher Dixon, CA	204. Catherine French Moorestown, NJ
197. Barbara C. Flowers	205. Bonnie Friedman
Wilson, NC	Cherry Hill, NJ
198. Lonnie L. Floyd, Jr. (deceased) Forest, VA	206. Harvey M. Mitnick, as Executor of the Estate of Nathan A. Friedman; Nathan A. Friedman (Rollover IRA) Haddonfield, NJ

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 28 of 65

207.	Nicholas Fung New York, NY	215.	Virginia L. Geck, St. Georgen, Germany
208.	Linda Gaddini, Custodian for Gregory A. Gaddini San Francisco, CA	216.	Elizabeth Geers Tr. Revocable Trust UA 12/21/01 Concord, NH
209.	John M. Garrett Atlanta, GA	217.	Robert Gegnas Jupiter, FL
210.	Estate of Mary Ann Gates Atlanta, GA	218.	Garit Gemeinhardt Waxhaw, NC
211.	Mary H. Gault, Trustee Richard H. & Mary H. Gault Trust Vassar, Ml	219.	Dean Gentry St. Maries, ID
212.	Medric Gay St. Charles, MO	220.	J. B. George Granbury, TX
213	. Margaret L. Gear Sunnyvale, CA	221	. Nancy Gerard Minooka, IL
214	. Megan Gebhardt Lake Ozark, MO	222	. Karen Gerstein Quebec, Canada

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 29 of 65

223.	Bernard R. Gervais & Margaret E. Gervais, Trustees Yorktown, VA	231.	Patricia Glisson Riverview, FL
224.	Mary M. Gibbs Cohasset, MA	232.	Eugenia C. Glow San Diego, CA
225.	Kenneth W. Gibson Gretna, VA	233.	Jill Wender Goldstein Suffern, NY
226.	Shirley S. Gibson Gretna, VA	234.	Antone R. Gonsalves New Bedford, MA
227.	Deborah Hitchcock Gilbert Merrimac, MA	235.	Robert J. Goodwin Rochester, NY
228.	Marvel S. Gill Revocable Trust Marvel S. Gill, Trustee Meredith Frenette, Secondary Trustee Essex, CT	236.	Government of Singapore Investment Corporation Pte Ltd. c/o DRRT Miami, FL
229	Anita Giovannoni Walnut Grove, CA	237.	Constance C. Govi, Trustee Govi Residual Trust UA 9-8-06 San Rafael, CA
230	. William A. Glenn & Linda D. Glenn Carlinville, IL	238	Constance C. Govi, Trustee Govi Survivor Trust UA 9-8-06 San Rafael, CA

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 30 of 65

239.	Steve Graber New York, NY	247.	Kristin I. Grimes & Daniel E. Grimes Las Vegas, NV
240.	Beverly Ann Gracia & Elsie Souza JT TEN New Bedford, MA	248.	Jess Edward Grissom & Betty Ann Grissom, JTWROS Texarkana, TX
241.	Charles R. Grady Raleigh, NC	249.	Louie Grob, Jr. Williams, CA
242.	Lloyd D. Graham Knob Knob Noster, MO	250.	Richard J. Groleau & Rosa Lee M. Groleau, Trustees Richard J. Groleau & Rosa Lee M. Groleau Revocable Living Trust Sallisaw, OK
243.	William L. Graham Davie, FL	251.	Robin Poston Growley Charlotte, NC
244.	Deanna L. Gratrix Palmer, AK	252.	Charles J. Guenther Egg Harbor City, NJ
245	John Green Littleton, CO	253.	Susan Jane Gustafson & Paul Ellis Gustafson JT TEN Mesa, AZ
246	Frank V. Grimaldi Belmont, MA	254	. Barbara T. Guthneck Dallas, TX

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 31 of 65

255.	Dian Gutierrez Lake Villa, IL	263.	Melvin A. Harkins Bend, OR
256.	Betty S. Hair Chapin, SC	264.	Marcella Harris Glendale, CA
257.	The Hamer Living Trust Robert C. Hamer, TTEE Lucerne S. Hamer, TTEE Carpinteria, CA	265.	George E. Harrison Crossville, TN
258.	Carl A. Hamill Moon Township, PA	266.	Alice C. Harwick Fort Worth, TX
259.	Jenny Hann Hillsboro, OR	267.	Eugene H. Hasenberg & Ruth E. Hasenberg Trust Palm Harbor, FL
260.	Helen S. Hansen Pasadena, CA	268.	Tanya M. Hassell Fort Worth, TX
261.	Gary Joseph Hardegger Salem, OR	269.	Winfred K. Hassell Farmersville, TX
262.	Claudia J. Harewood Mattapan, MA	270.	Janice Hawkins & Norman Hawkins Sherman, TX

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 32 of 65

271. Norma Louise Hayden Family Trust UA 22-NOV-88 Norma Louise Hayden, Trustee Yorba Linda, CA	279. Roy D. Henrichson & Helen M. Henrichson, Trustees Henrichson Trust Franklin, TX
272. Alice E. Haynes Medford, MA	280. Kelly Dyan Hill (Roth IRA) Concord, NC
273. Steven J. Hays Kennewick, WA	281. Gwen F. Hintzen, aka Gwendolyn Hintzen Stockton, CA
274. Steven J. Hays TR. UA 05/01/92 Georgia Phillips Hays Irrevocable Trust Kennewick, WA	282. Leo Wesley Hoag (deceased) Salinas, CA
275. Ernest Headrick Mira Loma, CA	283. Lyle A. Hoefer & Joan M. Hoefer, JTWROS Littleton, CO
276. Linda Sue Headstream Katy, TX	284. Lyle A. Hoefer TOD Joan M. Hoefer Littleton, CO
277. Gloria Jean Helms Chickasha, OK	285. Wayne Hoelscher Keller, TX
278. Harriette H. Hendrix Thomaston, GA	286. Darlene M. Holben Highlands Ranch, CO

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 33 of 65

287.	Estate of Harlan H. Holben Highlands Ranch, CO	295.	HSBC Trinkaus Investment Managers S.A. c/o DRRT Miami, FL
288.	Nells S. Hoogendam New Bern, NC	296.	HSBC Trustee (Singapore) Limited, as trustee for OPC Executive (FUS) Scheme Singapore
289.	Louis Gordon Hooper Tahoe City, CA	297.	Sarah Hudson Tyringham, MA
290.	R. Hopewell Riverdale, GA	298.	Chase D. Hughes & Cathy A. Hughes Staunton, VA
291.	Katherine A. Horvath Hancock, MI	299.	Marmion Duane Hull Pacific Palisades, CA
292.	Patrick J. Gillbride, Trustee of the Mildred Mae Howell Trust Burlingame, CA	300.	Jose Icasiano, Jr. Vallejo, CA
293	Marcella T. Hoyt Pennington, NJ	301.	Hiromu Iida Burbank, CA
294	Doris Hrinda Gwynedd Valley, PA	302	International Fund Management S.A. Luxembourg

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 34 of 65

303.	Internationale Kapitalanlagegesellschaft mbH c/o DRRT Miami, FL	311.	Peggy E. Jalenak Memphis, TN
304.	Laura A. Iremonger Pittsburg, CA	312.	Preston and Beverley James TTEES Davis, CA
305.	Shinichi Ishikawa & Myrna E. Ishikawa JT TEN Camden, AR	313.	Vivian L. Jamison Yoe, PA
306.	E. George Iversen (deceased) Houston, TX	314.	Jax II Inc. Brooksville, FL
307.	Roman & Tracey Iwanczuk TTEE Iwanczuk Family Trust dated 10/29/1999 Cradley, United Kingdom	315.	Richard Jazwin & Jan Jazwin Phoenix, AZ
308.	George T. Jackson & Mildred V. Jackson, Trustees TR UA March '98 The George and Mildred Jackson Family Trust DTD 3/18/98 Spring Valley, CA	316.	William H. Jeffress, Jr. Washington, DC
309.	Jalenak Holdings Partnership Memphis, TN	317.	Estate of Rebecca M. Jenkins Rehoboth, DE
310.	Leo R. Jalenak, Jr. Memphis, TN	318.	Peggy M. Jennings, TTEE UA DTD 7/20/01 The Jennings Living Trust Pollock Pines, CA

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 35 of 65

319.	Norman Jernberg (deceased) & Kayette C. Jernberg Carson City, NV	327.	Alphonse I. Johnson & Veronica E. Johnson Newark, IL
320.	Willy H. Jeromin (IRA) New London, NH	328.	Lawrence W. Johnson, TTEE UA DTD 2/5/03 Johnson Family Trust Rocklin, CA
321.	Jerry E. Finger 1976 Childrens Trust, FBO Walter G. Finger Houston, TX	329.	Michael D. Johnson Leo, IN
322.	Jerry E. Finger Family Trust DTD 12/22/89 FBO Walter G. Finger Houston, TX	330.	Robert B. Johnson & Portia J. Johnson Wernersville, PA
323.	Jerry E. Finger Family Trust UTA DTD 12/22/89 FBO Richard Finger Houston, TX	331.	Roy O. Johnson Keene, NH
324.	Kenneth Alan Jewett, Trustee Bruce Willits King Family Trust Nevada City, CA	332.	Cora M. Jones Coeburn, VA
325,	Clarence F. Johnson, Jr. Harvest, AL	333.	Cora M. Jones & Herbert Donald Jones (deceased) Coeburn, VA
326.	Averill Ann Johnson Walters Corpus Christi, TX	334.	Elise U. Jones Mt. Pleasant, SC

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 36 of 65

335.	Rotha J. Jones Green Bay, VA	343.	Ellaneita Keenum TTEE Bypass Trust w/ Keenum Family Living Trust Farmers Branch, TX
336.	Leland D. Jungmeyer & Betty M. Jungmeyer JT TEN Lohman, MO	344.	Gary Keierleber & Beverly Keierleber Camano Island, WA
337.	Carolyn Kachmann Hilton Head, SC	345.	Frederick C. Kemmerley Elloree, SC
338.	Norman R. Kahant (deceased) Lake Worth, FL	346.	Peter J. Kennedy (deceased) & Ethel V. Kennedy JT TEN Sea Girt, NJ
339.	Patricia A. Karsten (Roth IRA) Boerne, TX	347.	Helen M. Kerbavaz Richmons, CA
340.	Aaron Katz New York, NY	348.	George A. Keyser Ramona, CA
341.	Joel R. Katz, individually and as Trustee for Margolin Family Trust A, Margolin Family Trust B, and Joel R. Katz Family Trust New York, NY	349.	Dr. William J. Kinnard, Jr. Baltimore, MD
342.	David Hersholt Kauffman & Ruth Kauffman, Trustees Kauffman Family Trust Dated July 20, 1994 Los Angeles, CA	350.	James R. Klaus Bristol, PA

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 37 of 65

351.	Lisa Kleback (as beneficiary of Ruth A. Nagy) Gainesville, VA	359.	Michael Kurnitz Irrevocable Living Trust Harold Kurnitz, Trustee New York, NY
352.	Edward F. Kline, Jr. La Mesa, CA	360.	Ruth Kurnitz Irrevocable Living Trust, Harold Kurnitz, Trustee New York, NY
353.	Anne P. Knecht Emmaus, PA	361.	Pamela Kyu San Francisco, CA
354.	Ken Koch & Luretta Koch Lawrenceburg, TN	362.	Gloria C. Ladore Laconia, NH
355.	Rebecca Koraska & John T. Koraska (deceased) Tyler, TX	363.	Mary Margaret Lamberson Monett, MO
356.	Yolanda B. Korth Cypress, TX	364.	Silas B. Langfitt III TTEE Silas B. Langfitt III Revocable Trust DTD January 27, 2000 Thomasville, NC
357.	Andrew J. Kosinski & Margaret A. Kosinski TR UA 5/18/1998 Kosinski Trust Winter Springs, FL	365.	Lansdowne Developed Markets Fund Ltd. c/o DRRT Miami, FL
358.	Loretta M. Kuhn San Diego, CA	366.	Lansdowne Developed Markets Fund, L.P. c/o DRRT Miami, FL

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 38 of 65

367.	Lansdowne Global Financials Fund Limited c/o DRRT Miami, FL	375.	The JK and MD Lehman Family Trust, Jack Kiehl Lehman, TTEE Lacey, WA
368.	Lansdowne Global Financials Fund, L.P. c/o DRRT Miami, FL	376.	Derick Harry Leonard Jacksonville, FL
369.	Linda M. LaPointe Washington, UT	377.	Robert B. Leonard Ontario, CA
370.	Robert H. Largey & Marguerita Quinn Largey Union, NJ	378.	Christine Levandusky West Warwick, RI
371.	Charlotte L. Larrick TR UA 2/25/1990 Charlotte Lee Larrick Trust Columbia, MO	379.	Diane Lewis & Gregory W. Lewis (deceased) IRA Calabash, NC
372.	John Laubach & Marilyn Laubach Shelton, WA	380.	Evelyn Ligon New York, NY
373.	Jean K. Lauder & W. B. Lauder, Jr. (deceased) Weslaco, TX	381.	F.A. Lingl, M.D. Chagrin Falls, OH
374.	Robert Jay Lee Flushing, NY	382.	Friedrich A. Lingl, Trustee Friedrich A. Lingl Trust Chagrin Falls, OH

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 39 of 65

383.	Mildred S. Litt Albuquerque, NM	391.	Lynn Margaret Lovie The Villages, FL
384.	Frances DeJuan Littell Hugoton, KS	392.	Robert John Lovie The Villages, FL
385.	Elaine F. Lizzio & Elaine F. Lizzio, Trustee U/A DTD 04/10/02 Elaine F. Lizzio Trust Pompano Beach, FL	393.	Judith A. Lowe Quebec, Canada
386.	Wallace M. Lodine Medina, WA	394.	Alfred H. Lowen & Gertrude E. Lowen JT TEN (both deceased) Boca Raton, FL
387.	Elizabeth R. Lohman & Verne D. Lohman Springfield, OR	395.	Gloria J. Loyola Antioch, CA
388.	Emilio M. Lontok Las Vegas, NV	396.	Ida Lu Rohnert Park, CA
389.	Lotte G. Lopez TOD Carmen L. Bright Melbourne, FL	397.	Louis Lubrano (Roth IRA) Fairview, NJ
390.	Estate of Elsie E. Lore State College, PA	398.	Ruth S. Lugar & Nancy J. Dixon (both deceased) JT TEN Frederick, MD

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 40 of 65

399.	Ruth S. Lugar (deceased) & Linda M. Lugar JT TEN Frederick, MD	407.	Yanier Marrero & Circe Martinez Las Vegas, NV
400.	Sylvia Luton Hausville, WA	408.	John G. Marshall & Wanda M. Marshall La Habra, CA
401.	Virginia M. Lyons Littleton, CO	409.	David L. Martin & Lillian M. Martin JT TEN Concord, VA
402.	Danois G. Madrid Daly City, CA	410.	Ralph B. Martin, Jr. Hanover, PA
403.	Ray C. Magee and Barbara J. Magee JT TEN Shelburne, VT	411.	Sebastien Masclet Zellwood, FL
404.	Evan Magruder New York, NY	412.	Laura Harris Mason Pittsboro, NC
405.	Rima Manookian Northridge, CA	413.	Patricia A. Mason & H. Leslie Mason JT TEN Bradenton, FL
406.	Donna Marchetti Alameda, CA	414.	John P. Mathews and Florence M. Mathews, TTEES The John and Florence Mathews Family Trust Tiffin, OH

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 41 of 65

415.	Lottie E. Mathews TTEE Carthage, MO	423.	Marjorie B. McCann Jericho, VT
416.	Melvin F. Matsumoto & Lynne Reiko Matsumoto (deceased), Trustees Lynne Reiko & Melvin F. Matsumoto Family Trust U/A DTD 6/12/2001 San Jose, CA	424.	Wilson C. McCarthy Vienna, VA
417.	Dorothy Mauro Fremont, CA	425.	Edward P. McCool & Barbara J. McCool, Trustees McCool Rev Living Trust UA 3/7/96 Wakefield, RI
418.	Elizabeth A. May Belen, NM	426.	Anne B. McCormick & John Christopher Speakman Corvallis, OR
419.	Elizabeth A. May, TTEE U/A DTD 5/01/01 May Family Trust Belen, NM	427.	Mary A. McCormick, Trustee Mary A. McCormick Revocable Trust Raleigh, NC
420.	Nancy C. May, TTEE The May Family Trust Arcadia, CA	428.	Ramphan T. McCray St. Paul, MN
421.	Patricia Ann Mayer Grove City, OH	429.	Mary J. McCrindle West Park, NY
422.	Marie Mazzaferro & Frank Mazzaferro Rome, NY	430	Joy A. McElroy Tr. UA 24-Mar-88 The McElroy Living Trust Glendora, CA

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 42 of 65

431.	Alice M. McFadden Buford, GA	439.	Maria H. Mendes Boston, MA
432.	McGrew Family Revocable Trust, U/A DTD 8/19/03, James A. McGrew & Mary L. McGrew, Trustees Palatine, IL	440.	Joseph W. Mengel Chapel Hill, NC
433.	Catherine Rae McHaffey Colorado Springs, CO	441.	George C. Mertel, decendent Estate of George C. Mertel, James G. Mertel, Personal Rep., & James G. Mertel, as remaining Joint Tenant Baltimore, MD
434.	Dale J. McKee Greenwood, MS	442.	Neil Mesick Willimantic, CT
435.	Robert M. McKenzie & Elaine S. McKenzie JT TEN Joppatowne, MD	443.	Jean G. Mesropian Scottsdale, AZ
436.	Audrey McQuay Pacific Palisades, CA	444.	Beatrice J. Michaels Manorville, NY
437.	The MD Lehman Irrevocable Trust, Jack Kiehl Lehman, TTEE Lacey, WA	445.	William D. Michaely TTEE Michaely Living Trust U/A 9/22/04 Reno, NV
438.	Kathleen D. Mello New Bedford, MA	446.	Joan Letitia Miller Living Trust, Catherine M. Gray TTEE UA DTD 7/14/1998 Marion, NC

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 43 of 65

447.	Marie B. Miller Tucson, AZ	455.	James K. Moorman & Joan M. Moorman Batesville, IN
448.	Phyllis Milleville Orchard Park, NY	456.	Michael J. Moravan Fort Collins, CO
449.	Ada Minneci & Charlene Guarino TTEE Ada Minneci LVG TR U/A/D 3-10-04 Rockford, IL	457.	Kenneth M. Morrison Needham Heights, MA
450.	Karen K. Mizusaki Las Vegas, NV	458.	Margaret Jane Mugisch Wyckoff, NJ
451.	Laureen K. Mohn Detroit, MI	459.	Joel Munoz Encinitas, CA
452.	MONTANCO (nominee partnership), by Margaret K. Gutmann, General Partner Middletown, CT	460.	Susan L. Murray South Pasadena, CA
453.	Estate of Elizabeth F. Moore Pennington, NJ	461.	Richard L. Muth Richard L. Muth Family Trust Mission Viejo, CA
454	Ozella M. Moore St. Louis, MO	462	Maharaj Muthusamy St. Louis, MO

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 44 of 65

463.	David Nagy (as beneficiary of Ruth A. Nagy) Leesburg, VA		Mirna M. Neda New York, NY
464.	Ruth A. Nagy Haymarket, VA	472.	Catherine A. Nelson Ballwin, MO
465.	Edith Naiser Houston, TX	473.	Kathy J. Nelson Plainsboro, NJ
466.	Shirley Nakagawa & Richard M. Nakagawa (deceased) Fresno, CA	474.	Tom E. Nelson III Austin, TX
467.	Donald M. Nash & Geraldine G. LaBarbera Tampa, FL	475.	Elvira R. Neuendorf Jacksonville, FL
468.	Albert C. Nassan Vermontville, NY	476.	Kristin E. Neufeld Auburn, NY
469.	Paul J. Nau Pisgah Forest, NC	477.	New York State Common Retirement Fund Albany, NY
470.	Vilma Nau Pisgah Forest, NC	478.	New York State Teachers' Retirement System Albany, NY

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 45 of 65

479.	Angelin N. Newton (IRA) Dothan, AL	487.	George A. Nurisso (Roth IRA) Avon, CT
480.	Hoang N. Nguyen Las Vegas, NV	488.	George A. Nurisso (Traditional IRA) Avon, CT
481.	Father Martin Nikodem Trumbull, CT	489.	George A. Nurisso, Custodian for George C. Nurisso, UTMA Avon, CT
482.	Janet S. Nishimura TR UA 29-Dec-92 Janet Shizue Nishimura Revocable Trust Honolulu, HI	490.	Beverly J. Obedzinski Crystał River, FL
483.	Janet S. Nishimura TR UA 29-Dec-92 Masayoshi Nishimura Revocable Trust Honolulu, HI	491.	Eileen O'Brien TR UA 5/06/98 Eileen O'Brien Revocable Trust Homer Glen, IL
484.	Elaine Noreck & Bernard E. Noreck JT TEN Shelby Township, MI	492.	Estate of Evelyn Odlivak, Barbara DeRosa (beneficiary) New York, NY
485.	Mary Louise Novak Seaford, DE	493.	William R. Oeding & Barbara P. Oeding Destin, FL.
486.	. George A. Nurisso Avon, CT	494.	Susan J. Omlor Sandusky, OH

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 46 of 65

495.	Estate of John R. Orrick Towson, MD	503.	William Owen, Jr. & Charity E. Owen Family Trust Charity E. Owen, Sole Trustee William Brian Owen, POA Yuba City, CA
496.	Ann M. O'Shaughnessy Naples, FL	504.	Violet M. Oyama Honolulu, HI
497.	Ann M. O'Shaughnessy & Joseph F. O'Shaughnessy Naples, FL	505.	Richard J. Palicka Lisle, IL
498.	Joseph F. O'Shaughnessy Naples, FL	506.	Donald M. Papa & Cleo E. Papa, Trustees Donald M. Papa & Cleo E. Papa Trust TR UA 02-04-1993 Cypress, TX
499.	Alyce M. Othot Nashua, NH	507.	The Parker Family Investments LLC Englewood, NJ
500.	David R. Overfield Independence, KS	508.	Drew E. Parker Englewood, NJ
501.	Phyllis A. Overmier Upper Sandusky, OH	509.	Jeffrey R. Parker Englewood, NJ
502.	Jeanne M. Overton & Annette Papin Anitoch, CA	510.	Keith Parker Memphis, TN

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 47 of 65

511.	Michael A. Parker Englewood, NJ	519.	Dolores A. Pechette TR UA 3-31-10 Dolores A. Pechette Revocable Trust Portland, OR
512.	Carolynn P. Parr Concord, NC	520.	Rosemarie A. Pekarek Toms River, NJ
513.	Charles E. Parramore, Jr. Camilla, GA	521.	Lester A. Pelkey Essex, VT
514.	Julius Passalacqua & Cecilia M. Passalacqua, Trustees UA 10/29/97 The Passalacqua Trust Willoughby, OH	522.	Joady Boulware Perrett, Trustee Joe Boulware Trust U/T/A DTD 1/21/1987 Hendersonville, NC
515.	Frances Pastan Silver Spring, MD	523.	Erik P. Perrin Daphne, AL
516.	Anna Pateka Baltimore, MD	524.	Richard Petersen & Mary Alice Petersen TTEE 2002 Petersen Family Trust Castro Valley, CA
517.	Walter G. Paul & Ruth E. Paul Hines, OR	525.	Nancy Beth Peterson Egg Harbor, NJ
518.	T. Jay Paxton & Doris M. Paxton, TTEES T. Jay and Doris Paxton Trust Jackson, MI	526	. Ruth B. Phelps Alhambra, CA

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 48 of 65

527.	Clifford L. Phillips & Frances Phillips JT WROS Carbondale, 1L	535.	Vincent Plotner Fayetteville, PA
528.	The Piccioni Family 2003 Trust, UA 10/17/03, Mario Anthony Piccioni & Marian Louise Piccioni TTEES Riverside, CA	536.	Clyde M. Polichetti & Jo R. Polichetti Torrance, CA
529.	Ingeborg Pierce & Ingeborg Pierce (IRA) Hallandale, FL	537.	Norman Portello Trust B, Jean G. Portello TTEE Lafayette, CA
530.	Leroy E. Pietzsch Roscoe, TX	538.	Charles Porten, custodian for Mia Gussen Weston, CT
531.	Bernard E. Pile Tucson, AZ	539.	Charles Porten, custodian for Hanna Porten Weston, CT
532.	Nadia Piskaty Mountain View, CA	540.	Anna Posch Trust, John Posch, Jo Ann Posch & James H. Posch, Successor Trustees Morton Grove, IL
533.	James & Elaine Pitenis Daytona Beach, FL	541.	Susan Povak Brighton, MA
534.	Priscilla C. Piva & George Piva New Bedford, MA	542.	Barry S. Preis Ellensburg, WA

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 49 of 65

543.	Mildred L. Priest Quitman, AR	551.	Saroja B. Rajasekhara Rajasekhara Family Trust U/D/T DTD 9/1/2000 Glenwood, MD
544.	Profitable Investment Club, by Charlotte J. Burge, Treasurer Lorain, OH	552.	Irene A. Randle TR UA 24-APR-96 The Irene A. Randle Family Trust Sacramento, CA
545.	Public Employees' Retirement Association of Colorado Denver, CO	553.	Branko Rapo (deceased) Matulji, Croatia
546.	Donald D. Puett Overland Park, KS	554.	Michael G. Rebar (deceased) Des Moines, WA
547.	Arnold F. Punt, Sr. & Johanna Punt TTEES Arnold F. Punt Sr. Living Trust UA 01-08-1999 Sioux Center, IA	555.	Beverly Redgwick Pacific Grove, CA
548.	Diana Pyeatt Carrollton, TX	556.	Fay Reece Pampa, TX
549.	Robert L. Queener & Darlene M. Queener TR UA 02-Feb-00 Robert L. Queener Revocable Living Trust Port Charlotte, FL	557.	Alice J. Reed Holt, FL
550.	Dorothy Rabb TR UA 6/21/99 Dorothy Rabb Revocable Living Trust Winter Haven, FL	558.	John R. Reed Holt, FL

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 50 of 65

559.	Barbara J. Reeł Ankeny, IA	567.	Saleeta A. Roberts Thomaston, GA
560.	O. Gene Reising & Mary L. Reising JTWROS Evansville, IN	568.	Paul W. Robey Casey, IL
561.	Monte D. & Loa I. Reynolds Sun City, AZ	569.	Clair A. Robison & Grace Darlene Robison San Jose, CA
562.	Joseph C. Ridenhour, TTEE Joseph Ridenhour Revocable Trust UA DTD 5-27-2008 Ft. Lauderdale, FL	570.	Robert W. Robisch Mt. Airy, MD
563.	Edwin H. Rider, Jr. TTEE Gertrude A. Rider TTEE FBO Rider Living Trust Vancouver, WA	571.	Michael S. Rodriguez Tehachapi, CA
564.	Flora Rigotti Portland, OR	572.	Wilbert G. Rohlfsen Windom, MN
565.	David L. Riley, Sr. & Martina D. Riley Sacramento, CA	573.	Janet Romanowicz Avon, CT
566.	Joseph G. Robert East Providence, RI	574.	Janet Romanowicz (Roth IRA) Avon, CT

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 51 of 65

575.	Janet Romanowicz (Traditional IRA) Avon, CT	583.	Muriel Adams Sanford Orono, ME
576.	Elizabeth Cleland Ross (deceased) Eugene, OR	584.	Jack J. Sapia & Donna J. Sapia, JT TEN Miami, FL
577.	Betty Rowell Liberty, TX	585.	Sue Ann Sapiega Clearwater, FL
578.	Sandra Diane Royal Washington, DC	586.	Lisa B. Sapperstein Washington, DC
579.	Louis Ruffini & Barbara H. Ruffini as TTEES, 92 Louis & Barbara Ruffini REV TR UA DTD 4/30/92 Rocklin, CA	587.	Tim Sass Wayne, PA
580.	Eugene M. Salute Encino, CA	588.	Edward J. Saylor & Lorraine M. Saylor (deceased) Puyallup, WA
581.	Emilia B. Salvi & Alberto Salvi San Francisco, CA	589.	Nancy H. Scharber Winchester, TN
582.	Mariann Sandberg Addison, TX	590	Ethel Maxine Scher Enumclaw, WA

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 52 of 65

591.	Ronald R. Schlemer Denton, MD	599.	Schwab Dividend Equity Fund San Francisco, CA
592.	Gary Schlierf San Diego, CA	600.	Schwab Financial Services Fund San Francisco, CA
593.	Anna L. Schoenly & Richard D. Schoenly Potomac, MD	601.	Schwab Fundamental US Large Company Index Fund San Francisco, CA
594.	William A. Schultes & Patricia D. Schultes Kerrville, TX	602.	Schwab Institutional Select S&P 500 Fund San Francisco, CA
595.	Lois G. Schumann Maquoketa, IA	603.	Schwab Investments San Francisco, CA
596.	Schwab 1000 Index Fund San Francisco, CA	604.	Schwab MarketTrack Balanced Portfolio San Francisco, CA
597.	Schwab Capital Trust San Francisco, CA	605.	Schwab MarketTrack Growth Portfolio San Francisco, CA
598.	Schwab Core Equity Fund San Francisco, CA	606.	Schwab Premier Equity Fund San Francisco, CA

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 53 of 65

607.	Schwab S&P 500 Index Fund San Francisco, CA	615.	Helen E. Seim Walnut Creek, CA
608.	Schwab S&P 500 Index Portfolio San Francisco, CA	616.	Select Investors Exchange Fund, L.P. Houston, TX
609.	Schwab Total Stock Market Index Fund San Francisco, CA	617.	Michael Serko, Jr. & Agnes Serko, JT TEN Endwell, NY
610.	Larry E. Scott & Laurelee M. Scott Goodyear, AZ	618.	Mary Jane Seth Baltimore, MD
611.	Otis T. Scott Fort Myers, FL	619.	William Doyle Shaffer Fremont, OH
612.	Jean L. Scovell York, PA	620.	Steven L. Shapiro as Custodian for Stacy Shapiro UGMA and Marci Shapiro UGMA Cherry Hill, NJ
613.	Dorothy C. Seaton Dublin, GA	621.	Thomas J. Sharkey, Jr. Watchung, NJ
614.	Estate of Richard Seidenberg Cherry Hill, NJ	622.	Robert J. Shaw Montreat, NC

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 54 of 65

623.	Mary L. Shay Revocable Living Trust UAD 11/21/02 Mary L. Shay, TTEE Bradenton, FL	631.	Philip J. Sinrich Deborah A. Sinrich JTWROS Stoughton, MA
624.	Elizabeth Shuck Bridgeport, CT	632.	Linda D. Sinz Elk Grove, CA
625.	Ramon E. Shultz Bullhead City, AZ	633.	Anthony A. Sirco Albuquerque, NM
626.	Carolyn H. Shumway Lighthouse Point, FL	634.	Robert K. Skelding & Patricia A. Skelding, TTEE Skelding Family Trust Cadillac, MI
627.	Harry D. Sigler (deceased) Mission Hills, CA	635.	Nicholas A. Skinner Stowe, VT
628.	Harry D. Sigler (deceased) & Bonnie L. Sigler JT TEN Mission Hills, CA	636.	Leigh Skipper Willow Grove, PA
629.	Rita B. Sigman Tequesta, FL	637.	RuthAnn Harper Skowronek Weed, CA
630.	Patricia C. Simi TR UA 23-Dec-00 Simi Exemption Trust Roseburg, OR	638.	Roger L. Slakey & Mari-Ellen Slakey Roger L.B. Slakey Rev. Trust McLean, VA

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 55 of 65

639.	Elaine W. S. Smith C. Bradford Smothers JT WROS Hot Springs, AR	647.	Julie Parker Sorin Memphis, TN
640.	Elwin R. Smith Jacksonville, FL	648.	Luka Sosic Irvine, CA
641.	Joe J. Smith (deceased) & Teresa Smith JT TEN Belle Fourche, SD	649.	Raymond A. Sozio & Annette M. Sozio Ft. Lauderdale, FL
642.	Leonard Smith Mt. Vernon, IL	650.	Billie H. Spencer (Trust & IRA) Laguna Woods, CA
643.	Soreu Soe San Jose, CA	651.	Robert E. Spencer Raleigh, NC
644.	Samuel M. Sokoloff Long Beach, NY	652.	Marie J. Spirito Providence, RI
645	Christian Solms-Baruth (IRA) Leonardtown, MD	653.	N. Lavonne Spray Moses Lake, WA
646	Melissa Solms-Baruth (IRA) Leonardtown, MD	654.	Nathaniel David Springer Stillwater, OK

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 56 of 65

	illip Stadtler, Jr. Ilmar, CA		Howard Stinson Aztec, NM
Na	nilip Alan Steed, TTEE atalie E. Steed Trust an Diego, CA	664.	Earl J. Stitley (deceased) Hanover, PA
	ouglas W. Steele hapel Hill, NC	665.	Paul H. Stofer & Carol Λ. Stofer Climax, MI
	orothy M. Stenstrom ledford, OR	666.	Gloria C. Stone Pompton Plains, NJ
Ti C	.V. Stephenson 06 Intervivos rust, UA Dated 11/1/06, Redfern J. English, TTEE Moraga, CA	667.	Palmer L. Stone & Lu Ann R. Stone (deceased) TIC Fort Myers, FL
L	Marvin F. Stevenson & acille P. Stevenson (deceased) McDonough, GA	668.	Stratim Capital, LLC San Francisco, CA
	Genevieve E. Stewart Vayne, NY	669.	Stratim Partners, LLC San Francisco, CA
	stichting Pensioenfonds ABP Amsterdam, Netherlands	670.	Frank G. Straub Fishkill, NY

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 57 of 65

671.	Scott A. Strauss Charlotte, NC	679.	Swiss & Global Asset Management (Luxembourg) S.A. c/o DRRT Miami, FL
672.	Cora M. Streit TTEE Cora M. Streit Trust U/A DTD Dec. 16, 1992 DeSoto, TX	680.	Swiss & Global Asset Management Ltd. c/o DRRT Miami, FL
673.	Norma C. Struthers Orange, CA	681.	Swisscanto Asset Management AG c/o DRRT Miami, FL
674.	Wanda H. Swanson Evans, GA	682.	Edwin Szumachowski York, PA
675.	Kenneth D. Swartz & Fran A. Swartz Upper Sandusky, OH	683.	Suzanne Talbott Marietta, CA
676.	Roger H. Swartz Palatine Bridge, NY	684.	Andrew Edward Tarling Erith, United Kingdom
677.	Charlene R. Swiney Lancaster, CA	685.	Carter Cover Taylor Tacoma, WA
678.	Janet Pomeroy Swingler Dayton, WA	686.	Cherry Taylor Eugene, OR

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 58 of 65

687.	Joan M. Taylor, Trustee UA 5/26/98 The Joan M. Taylor Trust Spring Hill, FL	695.	Catherine V. Toole Mandeville, LA
688.	Larry G. Taylor Branson, MO	696.	Margarida L. Torchiana Beverly Farms, MA
689.	Nancy K. Taylor Cedar Key, FL	697.	TOTAL S.A. Courbevoie, France
690.	Nancy Tempesta East Hanover, NJ	698.	Jana Lee Trebels Trust, Dated January 19, 1998, Linda Lee Trebels Fahey, Successor Trustee Glenview, IL
691.	Winnie Thein Monterey Park, CA	699.	Susan E. Trippet Bloomington, IN
692.	Jeanne E. Thompson Fair Oaks, CA	700.	Leonard G. Trotter Rockaway Beach, OR
693.	Ames B. Tillar & Sudie D. Brothers JT TEN Emporia, VA	701	. David Tull New Port Richey, FL
694.	Doris Myrl Tillis Laguna Woods, CA	702	. Fern Key Ulmer Lodge, SC

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 59 of 65

703. T. Edward Umphres & Lillian G. Umphres St. Louis, MO	711. Frederick Conrad Vonvoigt & Frances Vonvoigt Tr. UA 23-OCT-98, The Vonvoigt Family Trust Temecula, CA
704. Matsuko Uyeda & Wallace Ida (deceased) Kapaa, Kauai, HI	712. Mary N. Wade, GP Johnson Investors, LP Franklin, TN
705. Helen Valkosky Wintersville, OH	713. Leonard & Mildred Walker Family Trust U/A DTD 11/01/2005 Petersburg, MI
706. Christopher C. Van Collie TTEE FBO Ruth A. Van Collie Trust U/A/D 12-09-1996 Bradenton, FL	714. Robert D. Walker Fulton, MS
707. Mary S. VanderLinde (including TOD Scott. H. VanderLinde, TOD Martha J. Hart, TOD Kristin K. McKay) Holland, MI	715. Dale E. Wallace Wichita, KS
708. W. C. Vandiver, Jr. Savannah, GA	716. Richard B. Wallace TTEE Scottsdale, AZ
709. Emilio A. Vazquez & Migdalia Vazquez & Emilio A. Vasquez, Jr. JT TEN Miami, FL	717. Barbara L. Walsh Narragansett, RI
710. Anna Vilkaitis & Agnes Scott Foundation, Inc. Avon Park, FL	718. Lawrence J. Warns Watsonville, CA

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 60 of 65

719.	Paul Watkins Wellesley, MA	727.	Sylvia Weissman Teaneck, NJ
720.	Larry L. Watson (IRA) Hagerstown, MD	728.	Elliot Wender Memphis, TN
721.	Patricia A. Watson South Windsor, CT	729.	Mark D. Wender; individually and as custodian for Brian Wender and Rebecca Wender Memphis, TN
722.	Lorraine S. Way Charlotte, NC	730.	Penina Wender Memphis, TN
723.	Elizabeth Weekley, TTEE Independence, MO	731.	Razelle Wender Memphis, TN
724.	Don Weining Newark, DE	732.	Stanley L. Wender Memphis, TN
725.	Cornelius F. Weinrich Ventura, CA	733.	Joseph P. White & Joseph P. White Sharetrust Fredericksburg, VA
726.	Jack Weiss & Barbara Weiss Yonkers, NY	734.	Rosalie A. Whitehead Peekskill, NY

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 61 of 65

735. Michael Whitney Boynton Beach, FL	743. The William J. McGinnis, Residuary Trust UA 2/23/08 Wilmington, DE
736. Mary Jane Whitty & Roxane Egan Schroon Lake, NY	744. R. Joseph Williams, Jr. (Roth IRA) High Ridge, MO
737. Harry A. Wicht & Joyce A. Wicht Culpeper, VA	745. Williamson Family Trust, Robert P. and Madeline M. Williamson, Trustees Rancho Mirage, CA
738. Carolyn R. Wiedemeier St. Louis, MO	746. Steven P. Williamson Temecula, CA
739. Linda Wilburn & Richard Wilburn, JT Long Creek, OR	747. Jane R. Wilson Carmel Valley, CA
740. Evangeline A. Wilcox Johnstown, NY	748. Thomas J. Wilson & Beth A. Wilson JT TEN Wentzville, MO
741. Cleo J. Wiley Bend, OR	749. Carolyn K. Winter Tr. UA 6/23/05 Winter Family Trust Coarsegold, CA
742. Timothy J. Willard Fallbrook, CA	750. Justin D. Wolf Charlotte, NC

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 62 of 65

751.	Jane B. Wollaston La Jolla, CA	759.	David P. Yaffe Los Angeles, CA
752.	Women of the Uniontown Presbyterian Church Faunsdale, AL	760.	Wanda L. Young West Milton, OH
753.	The Women of the Uniontown Presbyterian Church, First Presbyterian Church Faunsdale, AL	761.	Arthur L. Youngblood & Elizabeth E. Youngblood Mobile, AL
754.	Margaret C. Wood Lilburn, GA	762.	Owen R. Zachritz Faulkton, SD
755.	Donni K. Woods & Phillip J. Woods Wichita, KS	763.	Nancy A. Zidle & Gerald S. Zidle JTWROS Hooksett, NH
756	Donald B. Workman La Crescenta, CA	764	Judith A. Ziegert Mason, OH
757	. Hazel P. Wright (fka Hazel L. Pugh) & Roy L. Pugh, JTWROS Jacksonville, FL	765	Doris A. Zimmer TTEE Lionel N. Zimmer TTEE The Doris A. Zimmer Rev Trust U/A DTD 7/7/92 Richmond, VA
758	. Peter C. Wyatt Newburyport, MA	766	. Roger H. Zion, TTEE Otto Knauss Trust FBO Marjorie Zion UAD 12/29/1976 Evansville, IN

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 63 of 65

767.	James E. Zlibin & Susan C. Zlibin TTEE, Zlibin Living Trust Minden, NV	775.	Joseph F. Ferguson & Agnes M. Ferguson Gibsonia, PA
768.	Cornelia Zoon Federal Way, WA	776.	Beverly Gaines Dallas, TX
769.	Phillip Bayarena Ridgecrest, CA	777.	Harry R. Gould Nutley, N.I
770.	Donna J. Baynes (Roth IRA) Belmont, CA	778.	Virginia Higgins & Drexel Scott Warren, OH
7 71.	Donna T. Brimhall Ogden, UT	779.	Julia A. Hoyle (deceased) Sanford, NC
772.	Patricia P. Brown Thomasville, GA	780.	John D. Pruett and Penny Coull TTEEs of John & Lucille Pruett Intervivos Trust Norristown, PA
773.	Jane Burr Southport, CT	781.	Rodney J. Ross, Brenda M. Ross, & The Ross Family Trust Gilbert, AZ
774.	Julian R. Denison Oldwick, NJ	782.	Mildred E. Ruff Cupertino, CA

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 64 of 65

783.	William J. Skeats & Claire T. Skeats Commack, NY	791.	Jerry Hackett Macomb, MI
784.	Leland S. Swanson & Luella M. Swanson Puyallup, WA	792.	Fay Helmon Issaquah, WA
785.	Charles E. Van Over Montrose, CO	793.	Clarice Hogan Jones Charlotte, NC
786.	Benny M. Wade Reno, NV	794.	James H. & Mary V. Nieuwenhuis Trust, UA 23-Jun-86 Mary V. Nieuwenhuis, Trustee San Diego, CA
787.	Melissa Abich-Espinoza San Gabriel, CA	795.	Marjorie M. Kelley Westwood, MΛ
788.	Susan C. Bauer Garland, TX	796.	Elizabeth A. King TTEE FBO King Family Trust UA 07 27 92 Fullerton, CA
789.	Michael Evan Eldridge Spring Lake, MI	797.	Estate of Julius H. Linkkila Brooklyn, CT
790.	James A. Gibbs Carson City, Nevada	798.	Lianc Lion London, England

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871 Filed 04/09/13 Page 65 of 65

799.	Thomas Loffland Fort Worth, TX	807.	Francis R. Slattery & Philomena C. Slattery JT TEN Norristown, PA
800.	Joe E. Maxwell Nashville, TN	808.	Philomena C. Slattery & Francis R. Slattery JT TEN Norristown, PA
801.	Thelma McClain (deceased) Riverside, CA	809.	Karen Glover Wilmoth, TRS FBO Wilmoth JT Grantors Trust Dallas, TX
802.	Mosko Irrevocable Trust UA 3 22 91 Frank Thomas Mosko, Trustee Bayfield, CO	810.	Channa Weeratunge Kinwood, TX
803.	Geena J. Oh Los Angeles, CA	811.	Rotondo Family Trust Redmond, WA
804.	Michael F. Sands Tustin, CA		
805.	George N. Scheller Tucson, AZ		
806.	Francis R. Slattery IRA Norristown, PA		

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871-1 Filed 04/09/13 Page 1 of 5

United States District Court
Southern District of New York
Office of the Clerk
U.S. Courthouse
500 Pearl Street, New York, N.Y. 10007-1213

Date:

In Re:

-V-

Case #:

()

Dear Litigant,

Enclosed is a copy of the judgment entered in your case.

Your attention is directed to Rule 4(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, which requires that if you wish to appeal the judgment in your case, you must file a notice of appeal within 30 days of the date of entry of the judgment (60 days if the United States or an officer or agency of the United States is a party).

If you wish to appeal the judgment but for any reason you are unable to file your notice of appeal within the required time, you may make a motion for an extension of time in accordance with the provision of Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5). That rule requires you to show "excusable neglect" or "good cause" for your failure to file your notice of appeal within the time allowed. Any such motion must first be served upon the other parties and then filed with the Pro Se Office no later than 60 days from the date of entry of the judgment (90 days if the United States or an officer or agency of the United States is a party).

The enclosed Forms 1, 2 and 3 cover some common situations, and you may choose to use one of them if appropriate to your circumstances.

The Filing fee for a notice of appeal is \$5.00 and the appellate docketing fee is \$450.00 payable to the "Clerk of the Court, USDC, SDNY" by certified check, money order or cash. No personal checks are accepted.

Ruby J. Krajick, Clerk of Cou

by:

, Deputy Clerk

APPEAL FORMS

U.S.D.C. S.D.N.Y. CM/ECF Support Unit

1

Revised: May 4, 2010

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871-1 Filed 04/09/13 Page 2 of 5

•	
United States District C Southern District of New Office of the Clerk U.S. Courthouse 500 Pearl Street, New York, N.Y.	York
-V-	NOTICE OF APPEAL
Notice is hereby given thathereby appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seco	(party) nd Circuit from the Judgment [describe it]
entered in this action on the day of (mont) (year)
	(Signature) (Address)
Date: ((City, State and Zip Code) (Telephone Number)

Note: You may use this form to take an appeal provided that it is received by the office of the Clerk of the District Court within 30 days of the date on which the judgment was entered (60 days if the United States or an officer or agency of the United States is a party).

APPEAL FORMS

Case 1:09-md-02058-PKC Document 871-1 Filed 04/09/13 Page 3 of 5

FORM 1					
	tes District C				
	strict of New	York			
	of the Clerk Courthouse				
500 Pearl Street, No		10007-1213			
	X				
		ON FOR EX	TENSI	N OF	теме:
		ILE A NOT			
-V-					
	1	civ.	()	
•					
	X				
Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5),					respectfully
		(party)			
requests leave to file the within notice of appeal	out of time.			(par	tv)
desires to appeal the judgment in this action ente	ered on				ailed to file a
		(day)			
notice of appeal within the required number of da	ays because:				
[Explain here the "excusable neglect" or "good cause	" which led to y	our failure to f	ile a noti	ce of app	eal within the
required number of days.]					
		İ			
		(Sig	nature)		
		(Ad	dress)		
		(Au	шсээ)		
. ·					
		(City, Stat	e and Zip	Code)	
Deter	(1	_		
Date:	((Telepho	ne Numbe	r)	

Note: You may use this form, together with a copy of Form 1, if you are seeking to appeal a judgment and did not file a copy of Form 1 within the required time. If you follow this procedure, these forms must be received in the office of the Clerk of the District Court no later than 60 days of the date which the judgment was entered (90 days if the United States or an officer or agency of the United States is a party).

Distract Court will receive it within the 30 days of the date on whethe United States or an officer or agency of the United States is a	ich the judgment was entered (60 days if party).
FORM 3	
United States District C Southern District of New Office of the Clerk U.S. Courthouse 500 Pearl Street, New York, N.Y.	York
-V-	AFFIRMATION OF SERVICE
X	civ. ()
I,, de	clare under penalty of perjury that I have
served a copy of the attached	
whose address is:	
Date:New York, New York	
	(Signature)
·	(Address)
······	(City, State and Zip Code)
<u>FORM 4</u>	
ADDRESS ROPMS	

APPEAL FORMS

FORM 2			
	South	ed States District (ern District of New Office of the Clerk U.S. Courthouse treet, New York, N.Y.	v York
	-V-	X MOT	NOTICE OF APPEAL AND ION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
		X	civ. ()
		(party) e Second Circuit from	hereby appeals to the judgment entered on
	[Give a	a description of the ju	dgment]
2. In t	-	ot received in the Cler	k's office within the required time
	-	ot received in the Cler	
accordance	(party) with Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5). In support of this request	ot received in the Cler respectfully requests	k's office within the required time
accordance	(party) with Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5). In support of this request	ot received in the Cler respectfully requests	ck's office within the required time s the court to grant an extension of time in states that (party)
accordance a. this Court's	(party) with Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5). In support of this request judgment was received on _	ot received in the Cler respectfully requests	ck's office within the required time s the court to grant an extension of time in states that (party)
accordance a. this Court's	(party) with Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5). In support of this request judgment was received on _	ot received in the Cler respectfully requests	s the court to grant an extension of time in states that (party) and that this form was mailed to the
accordance a. this Court's	(party) with Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5). In support of this request judgment was received on _	ot received in the Cler respectfully requests	s the court to grant an extension of time in states that (party) and that this form was mailed to the (Signature)

Case 1:10-cv-00275-PKC Document 116 Filed 04/25/13 Page 1 of 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Office of the Clerk
U.S. Courthouse
500 Pearl Street, New York, NY

500 Pearl Street, New York, NY			
IN RE BANK OF AMERICA CORP. SECURITIES, DERIVATIVE, AND EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT (ERISA) LITIGATION	Master File No. 09 MDL 2058(PKC) ECF CASE		
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:			
CHARLES N. DORNFEST, Plaintiff	Civil Action No. 10-CIV-275 (PKC) ECF Case		
v.	NOTICE OF APPEAL		
BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION, MERRILL LYNCH & CO, INC., KENNETH D. LEWIS, JOE L. PRICE, NEIL A.COTTY, JOHN A. THAIN, WILLIAM BARNET III, FRANK P. BRAMBLE, SR., JOHN T. COLLINS, GARY L. COUNTRYMAN, TOMMY R. FRANKS, CHARLES K. GIFFORD, MONICA C. LOZANO, WALTER E. MASSEY, THOMAS J. MAY, PATRICIA E. MITCHELL, THOMAS M RYAN, O. TEMPLE SLOAN, JR., MEREDITH R. SPANGLER, ROBERT L. TILLMAN, and JACKIE M. WARD,			
Defendants.			

NOTICE is hereby given that Plaintiff Charles N. Dornfest hereby appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from the Judgment entered on April 9, 2013 (Docket # 871 in C.A. No. 09 MDL 2058 and Docket # 109 in C.A. No. 10

Case 13-1677, Document 82, 08/02/2013, 1007048, Page112 of 112

Case 1:10-cv-00275-PKC Document 116 Filed 04/25/13 Page 2 of 2

Civ. 275), insofar as the Judgment dismissed the complaint of Plaintiff Charles N. Dornfest for violations of the Securities Laws; and the ORDER, entered on September 29, 2011 (Docket # 468 in C.A. No. 09 MDL 2058 and Docket # 66 in C.A. No. 10 Civ. 275), denying Plaintiff Charles N. Dornfest the right to move to certify a class of BoA option investors.

Dated: New York, New York April 24, 2013

BRAGAR EAGEL & SQUIRE, PC

By: s/ Jeffrey H. Squire
Jeffrey H. Squire (JS 8910)
Raymond A. Bragar
Lawrence P. Eagel
885 Third Avenue, Suite 3040
New York, New York 10022
Telephone: (212) 308-5858
Facsimile: (212) 486-0462

ABBEY SPANIER, LLP

By: s/ Judith L. Spanier
Judith L. Spanier
Karin E. Fisch
212 East 39th St.
New York, New York 10016
Telephone: (212) 889 3700
Facsimile: (212) 684-5191

Attorneys for Plaintiff

To: ECF Service List